

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, DECEMBER, 25, 1869.

AS FAR AS popular feeling is concerned, it is undoubtedly fortunate for the Overend & Gurney directors that their trial did not take place two years ago. For the first twelve months after the stoppage of the company it would have been scarcely inaccurate to describe them as the most unpopular men in England. Every outburst of strong feeling, however, is followed by a revulsion, in addition to which there have been other causes tending to withdraw public sympathy from the prosecution. The verdict delivered on Wednesday has taken no one by surprise; and setting aside the intrinsic merits of the case, the advantages of advocacy and skilful conduct were all on the side of the defence. A particularly unfortunate blunder was made by the prosecution in bringing into the witness-box wholly unnecessarily, a witness whom the defence had been longing to call.

The charges on which the defendants were arraigned resolve themselves practically into a charge of conspiring to commit the offence marked out in section 84 of the Larceny Act, under which every director who makes or concurs in making any written statement or account which he knows to be false, with intent to cheat or defraud any shareholder or creditor, or to induce any person to become a shareholder, is rendered guilty of a misdemeanour.

Conspiracy is a very wide and vague offence almost, if not quite, incapable of receiving a definition. It is not enough to say that any conspiracy to do an unlawful act is criminal, for this would by no means include all cases. An act may be not criminal if committed by one person, it may not even be an act if the commission of which would subject the person committing it to the payment of damages on a civil action; and yet, if several persons combine to commit the same act, the combination may be indictable as a conspiracy. Thus it has been held to be a conspiracy to combine to hiss an actor, although a single individual might hiss him without incurring any liability whatever. In the present case the joint offence, if any, was an act which would have been an offence if committed by a single person, because it had already been made an offence by statute. It would have been enough to secure a conviction if the prosecution had proved that the defendants combined to put forth a wilful misstatement in order to induce any person to become a shareholder, and in proving this it would have been sufficient to prove an intent decided against the public generally, and acted on by some individual. It would also, as we think, have been sufficient to show that the misstatement was made, not necessarily with express knowledge of its falsehood, but in wilful ignorance of the facts, upon the principle on which a man might be convicted for knowingly receiving stolen goods if he wilfully closed his eyes against strong cause for suspicion. Happily it is not necessary for us to venture on the troubled sea of figures which appalled even the Lord Chief Justice himself. A complete investigation of the case has shown clearly enough that there was no

misstatement or concealment sufficient to support the charge. The accusation founded on the existence of two separate deeds falls completely to the ground: the utmost that can be said against the directors is, that they believed they had a business which, though it had been mismanaged, had in it the elements of success, and would succeed with new capital; but that, if they had given the public the materials on which they formed that opinion, the public would not have found the capital.

The Lord Chief Justice observed, in the course of his charge, that certain of the counts, were not maintainable as to persons who had purchased their shares in the market. This introduces a principle akin to that laid down by Lord Romilly, in *Duranty's case* (26 Beav. 268), that misrepresentation by directors will entitle a shareholder to repudiate shares purchased in the market, though it entitles him to get rid of an original allotment. This has long been recognised as a fixed principle and was re-affirmed in *Oakes v. Turquand*. The principle purports to be that there is in the former case no privity between the company and the purchaser of the shares. We cannot, however, help doubting the propriety of extending its operation to criminal charges like the present. If the intention is to induce A. B., as one of the public, to become a shareholder, by inserting in a prospectus false puffs of the company, the plan may succeed either by A. B.'s applying for shares direct, or by his buying shares of somebody else. The credit of the company has been wrongfully raised to such a height that A. B. takes the shares wherever he can get them; and if the intent was to raise the credit of the company, so that the public generally might be induced to become shareholders, it should matter nothing whether a man goes straight to the company's office for an allotment, or buys from anyone who will sell. There is a perceptible difference between a criminal case depending on the criminality of the intent and a civil one turning on the nature and results of the contract of membership.

Lord Hatherley has already held that there is no equitable remedy against the directors, and as they have now been acquitted on the criminal charge, it is probable that no further proceedings will be taken. The only proceedings now remaining open would be an action for misrepresentation, which, in the face of what has been shown at the late trial, could not hope to succeed—or an action on the case for negligence in investing the capital of the company in the purchase of a very bad bargain. The directors will probably be vexed no further. Concurring, however, as we do, most unreservedly, in the verdict just pronounced, we cannot sympathize in the smallest degree with the acclamation with which it was received by many of those who heard it. Although no legal fraud has been committed, yet, let the matter be put how it will, there remains this—that the directors had no right to invite the public to come into the business without informing them fully of its condition. Admittedly, the directors believed that with the new capital a success would be achieved for themselves and the shareholders, but those whom they invited to join them ought to have been placed in a position to judge of that question for themselves.

WHERE, as in England, there is no public prosecutor, but the duty of bringing to justice offenders against the State is thrown upon private individuals, it is evidently of the utmost importance—indeed, it is absolutely essential for the working of the system at all—that provision should be made for re-imbursing to prosecutors all expenses reasonably incurred in prosecutions properly undertaken by them. It is, important, therefore, that any defects or inconsistencies in the law upon this subject should be fully understood; and on at least two occasions lately the matter has been before the Courts.

Application was made to the Lord Chief Justice on Wednesday last for a certificate entitling the prosecutor

in the case against the Overend-Gurney directors to be repaid by the county the costs of the prosecution; and the Chief Justice—while he gave the reasons for which, if he had had the power, he would not have made the order asked for—further pointed out that, inasmuch as the case had been removed into the Queen's Bench by *certiorari*, he had, in fact, no such power. There is no doubt, we fear, upon the authority, that the Lord Chief Justice was right in his view. But it is a very grave and very mischievous anomaly that, because the accused think fit to change the tribunal, the prosecutor, however proper the prosecution, should be burdened with the costs.

As a general rule every prosecutor becomes such by his own act and of his own free will; but there are some cases in which a man may be compelled to prosecute. For instance, under section 223 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, an assignee in bankruptcy may be directed to prosecute the bankrupt for certain offences if committed by him, and the same section provided very properly, not only that the prosecutor in such a case should be allowed his expenses, to be paid by the county in the ordinary way, but also that any expenses incurred by him, and not allowed in this way, should be paid out of the fund, known as the Chief Registrar's Account. And the importance of this provision for extra costs beyond those strictly allowable on taxation will be at once understood by any one familiar with legal proceedings of any kind. But by the Courts of Justice (Salaries and Funds) Act of last session (32 & 33 Vict. c. 91), this fund with others was transferred to the National Debt Commissioners. It is true that by section 13 it is said, that amongst other things, "all sums payable, &c., out of any of the stock and cash transferred under this Act, &c., shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose." And it is possible that this section may be wide enough to cover the case in question; but, practically, there is, we believe, no doubt that, since the 1st October last, when the Act came into operation, there has been no fund out of which extra costs incurred by one directed to prosecute under the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, can be paid. Of course, under that Act, the difficulty will exist only till the 1st January next, but the case will remain much the same under the system which is then to come into operation. By section 16 of the Debtors Act (32 & 33 Vict. c. 62) a trustee may be ordered to prosecute a bankrupt, and, by section 17, he is in such case to be allowed his costs. But no provision is made for extra costs. We fear that this will interfere materially with the efficiency of prosecutions under the Act.

THE APPEAL FROM THE DECISION OF Vice-Chancellor James to wind up the Family Endowment Society—one of the companies amalgamated by the Albert—at the instance of an annuity holder, was heard this week before the Lord Chancellor and Lord Justice Giffard, when judgment was reserved, the Lord Chancellor observing that the point was one of great importance as governing so many cases. The decision will probably be delivered at the beginning of Hilary term. It is to be wished, for the settlement of doubts, that the same question had been raised in the case of a policy-holder.

THERE IS SOMETHING REMARKABLE in a letter published in the *Times* of Monday from Mr. R. Dawson, the attorney for the Overend & Gurney prosecution. The *Times* having accidentally omitted from its report the name of Mr. Yelverton, the second of the junior counsel for the prosecution, the attorney writes to request that the omission may be supplied. There was nothing very remarkable in this, but the attorney goes on to give Mr. Yelverton the benefit of a gratuitous certificate that he has "most assiduously attended to my instructions throughout," adding that to this junior his two leaders owe their briefs. Generally speaking, the leading counsel owe their briefs to the attorney, and not to their junior, who, in

the present case, is stated to have "introduced" Dr. Kenealy and Mr. Macrae Moir to Mr. Dawson. The principal remark, however, which we have to make upon this piece of correspondence is the following:—When a puff is published the reader ought to be told who makes it, as an index to its value. Having taken an opportunity of advertising the world that Mr. Yelverton had "most assiduously attended to his instructions," Mr. Dawson might in candour have stated that Mr. Yelverton is his own son.

THE *Economist* thinks that joint-stock companies should be obliged to publish their articles of association, and all documents referred to therein. We made a similar proposal some years ago, and still hold the same opinion. Intending shareholders, of course, can always, if they choose, "inspect" these documents; but it is a very different thing to read a document at your leisure in a printed copy. It may be said that the public would gain nothing, since experience shows that in making their investments they pay no attention to anything but their own fancies. Admitting all that can be urged on this score, and crediting the public with what is undoubtedly their due, gross carelessness, we still think that all these things may be exaggerated. Further than this, as our contemporary has pointed out, persons who will take no thought for themselves attend to the observations of the press, and, with the opportunities which such publication would afford, the press might make itself a very efficient censor of new undertakings.

#### THE ARMY AND THE LAW OF LIBEL.

The important decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in *Dawkins v. Lord F. Paulet*, on which we have already briefly commented, deserves the minute and attentive consideration of all who are interested in the development of constitutional law. According to the old fiction, each new proposition laid down by a superior court is nothing but the articulate embodiment of the mysterious treasure of common law which is supposed to be "in the breast of the judges." Yet there can be no doubt that judge-made law is often as entirely new as a legislative enactment. And of this unquestionable truth there could hardly be a more conclusive proof than the recent decision in the case of Colonel Dawkins. If the opinion of the majority of the judges be really law, an officer in the British army will for the future find himself, in many important respects, only one remove from an outlaw. Redress before the ordinary tribunals of the country will be denied him. For a civil wrong done to him by his superior in rank, he will have to seek such satisfaction as he may be able to obtain at the hands of a military court.

The recent case was decided upon demurrer, and for the purposes of the judgment all the allegations contained in the pleadings must be taken to be true. If they are capable of being borne out by the evidence, and the plaintiff is nevertheless unable to recover, his plight is indeed a sad one. His is emphatically one of those hard cases which it has been said make bad law. Let us see whether in this instance the opinion of the Chief Justice, who dissented from the rest of the Court, really is bad law, or whether it may not perhaps be supported as being in accordance with principle and not absolutely opposed to authority.

The declaration was for libel, and stated that the plaintiff was an officer in the army, and held a commission as captain in the Coldstream Guards, and that the defendant falsely and maliciously wrote and published of the plaintiff certain letters (which were the libels complained of) whereby the plaintiff lost his commission. The letters were, *prima facie*, of a defamatory and injurious nature.

To this declaration the defendant pleaded that he was the superior military officer of the plaintiff, and the plaintiff was under his command; that it was his duty, as such superior military officer, to forward to the adjutant-general

tant-general of the army certain letters written and sent to him, as such superior officer, in relation to their military conduct, duties, and qualifications by the officers under his command, and to make, for the information of the Commander-in-Chief, reports in writing to the adjutant-general on the subject of such letters; and the defendant, as such superior officer, had received from the plaintiff certain letters in relation to the military duties of the plaintiff, and to certain orders received by the plaintiff as such officer, and to his conduct and competence and fitness for his duties as such officer, in which letters the plaintiff requested that the same might be forwarded by the defendant to the adjutant-general for the information of the Commander-in-Chief of the army; and thereupon the defendant, in the ordinary course of his military duty as such superior officer, and because it became and was necessary and incumbent upon him, by his duty to her Majesty as such superior officer, so to do, and as an act of military duty, and not otherwise, forwarded the letters to the adjutant-general; and, for the information of the Commander-in-Chief, when forwarding such letters, made certain reports in writing in relation to the letters of the plaintiff, which are the letters of the defendant, and the writings and publishings complained of.

The plaintiff replied to this plea that the words in the declaration mentioned were written and published by the defendant with actual malice, and without any reasonable, probable, or justifiable cause, and not *bona fide* or in the *bona fide* discharge of the defendant's duty as such superior officer. The defendant demurred to the replication, on the ground that no action was maintainable against him in respect of words written and published under the circumstances alleged in the plea, even though they were written and published maliciously, and without reasonable or probable cause; and the Court (Mellor, Lush, and Hayes, JJ., Cockburn, C.J., dissenting) sustained the demurrer.

Now, upon the general principles of law, apart from any special rules which may govern the army, Colonel Dawkins would be certainly entitled to a verdict, if he succeeded in proving the facts stated in his replication. Express malice is, generally speaking, a good answer to the defence of privilege. A privileged occasion protects an ordinary person only within the limits of the *bona fide* discharge of his duty. Thus, a master may and of course is bound to give a bad character to a bad servant. But if he should maliciously do so he will be liable to an action. Nay, further, so jealous is the law that the good repute of nobody should be unjustly taken away, that "privilege" will not protect violent or extravagant assertions beyond what the particular occasion may justify. A good example of this will be found in *Fryer v. Kinnerley*, (12 W. R. 155), where the defendant, a member of the Horticultural Society, had hired the plaintiff as a gardener on the recommendation of the manager of the society. Subsequently, the defendant dismissed the plaintiff, and wrote to the manager that "Fryer was extremely violent, came towards me several times with an open clasp-knife in his hand, and eyes starting from the sockets with rage, a perfect raving madman." The jury, in an action of libel based on this letter, found that it was libellous but written *bona fide*, and not maliciously, and the question whether it was under these circumstances privileged or not was afterwards argued in the Court of Common Pleas. But the judges passed this question by, saying that whatever might be their opinion on it was not material, inasmuch as by the vehemence of the defendant's expressions he had, although acting *bona fide* and not maliciously, put himself outside the protection with which he might otherwise have been clothed.

But is there anything in the constitution of the army which should exclude soldiers from the operation of these general principles of law? It is replied that there is; that the army stands outside all our ordinary institutions;

and that by the Mutiny Act and Articles of War, a subordinate who is injured by his superior must seek his remedy from a military court of enquiry. The immunity from civil action enjoyed by the superior is also likened to that enjoyed by a judge or by jurors, an analogy which is obviously too imperfect to be worth much. A superior officer who forwards a report to the adjutant-general reflecting on a subaltern is much more like a prosecutor than a judge. Then, again, it is objected that a jury are an incompetent and unfit tribunal to try questions which may involve minute inquiries into military matters. The answer to this objection made by the counsel for the plaintiff in *Sutton v. Johnstone* (1 T. R. 493), appears irresistible. "The argument," he observed, "on the incompetency of juries to try questions of this nature [the action there was by one naval officer against another for malicious prosecution] is not entitled to much weight when it is considered that almost all the injuries which one individual may receive from another, and which are the foundation of numberless actions, involve in them questions peculiar to the trades and conditions of the parties. In an action against a surgeon for negligence the question may turn on a nice point of surgery; but the jury must attend to the witnesses, and decide according to their number, professional skill, and cause of knowledge; for, *cuiuslibet in sua arte credendum est*. In an action on a warranty in a life policy physicians must be examined. Many questions, even of navigation, must occur which must necessarily be decided by a jury, as in a case under the Hovering Act (24 Geo. 3 c. 47), when unavoidable necessity is to exculpate; so in cases of deviation on policies of insurance, or in cases of seaworthiness, or when one ship runs down another at sea by bad steering. Yet those actions are much more difficult, because they depend solely on questions of navigation. But the gist of the present action is malice and want of probable cause, which cannot involve any question of navigation or sea fighting, and the present verdict was not founded on any such evidence." We might summarise these remarks by saying that the professional incompetency of a jury is, in fact, the very measure and test of their judicial competency. Who would impanel a jury of doctors to try a charge of *malpraxis*? They would be admirable and necessary witnesses in such a case; but their professional and technical knowledge would stand in the way of their being impartial judges of the facts. The function of a jury is to find out the truth in each particular case which comes before them from the evidence, and that alone, and the fewer preconceived notions of what the truth is they bring into the box with them the better will they do their duty.

There only remains to be considered the proposition that the army is under the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War, or ought to be upon grounds of public policy entirely without the law. Such appears to be the opinion as to its position of the majority of the Court of Queen's Bench; and as that opinion was necessary to their decision, it is now law, as far as a court of first instance can make it so, that no action for defamation or, indeed, any other tort to the person will lie in a civil court at the suit of a subaltern against his superior officer. In other words the subaltern has no remedy at all, for, practically, it would be a mere mockery of justice to appeal in such a case to a military court. It is scarcely probable that this conclusion will be acquiesced in without an appeal to a court of error, especially when it is remembered that the present state of the authorities in the courts below is conflicting. Very few have been the cases in the reports in which the *status* of military or naval officers has even been discussed, and, as far as we are aware, there are only two in which it has been actually adjudicated on; the one now under our consideration and the great case of *Sutton v. Johnstone* to which we have already referred. So far as that case definitively decided any question of law it is in direct conflict with the present decision. The Court of Exchequer distinctly held in a considered judgment that an action *would* lie by a sub-



ordinate against a superior officer for a wrongful act done in the course of discipline, if done *malâ fide*. Their observations on the policy of allowing such an action are worth quoting—"Cases may be put of situations so critical that the power (of the superior) ought to be unbounded; but it is impossible to state a case where it is necessary that it should be abused; and it is the felicity of those who live under a free constitution of government that it is equally impossible to state a case where it can be abused with impunity. The counsel for the defendant were disposed to agree to this general doctrine, provided that the question was not to be discussed in an action at law which unavoidably brings the inquiry into a matter of fact before a jury. We enter into all the difficulties in the situation of an officer whose honour and fortune may come to be so staked. But considerations of this nature cannot exclude the established jurisdiction of the country. Men of honour will do their duty, and will abide the consequences."

This portion of the judgment was not overruled on appeal, although Lord Mansfield did, it is true, on behalf of Lord Loughborough and himself, intimate dissent from it. According to their view the plaintiff should have sought a remedy from a military tribunal "capable of understanding that the first, second, and third part of a soldier is obedience." For this or other reasons they "leaned" against introducing the action; but the judgment adds "there is no authority of any kind either way . . . and, therefore, it must be owned the question is doubtful. According to our opinion it is not necessary to the judgment in this case." And they proceed to decide against the plaintiff on the facts. We should add that the opinion above expressed against the action was assented to at *Nisi Prius* by Mr. Justice Willes in *Dawkins v. Lord Rokeby* (4 F. & F. 806). The authorities therefore now stand thus; for the plaintiff, *Sutton v. Johnstone*, in the Court of Exchequer, and the judicial dictum of Chief Justice Cockburn in *Dawkins v. Lord F. Paulet*; for the defendant, *Dawkins v. Lord F. Paulet*, in the Court of Queen's Bench, and the judicial dicta of Lords Mansfield and Loughborough in the Court of Error in *Sutton v. Johnstone*, and of Mr. Justice Willes in *Dawkins v. Lord Rokeby*. The balance of opinion, though not of decision, therefore, at present inclines somewhat in favour of the defendant. We shall await the further progress of the case with much interest. No doubt it is true, as Mr. Justice Mellor remarked, that a man may do his duty maliciously, but the real question seems to be whether the act done, when malice is the governing or only motive, does not cease to be an act of altogether. Malice, like violence of language, can undoubtedly in ordinary cases, turn what may be *primâ facie* lawful into what is unlawful; and, this being so, the only safe ground for the recent decision is that, by becoming soldiers, men, for some purposes, are deprived of their rights, and set free from their liabilities as citizens.

#### LEGAL REPORTING.

[COMMUNICATED.]

It does not require any great acuteness to see that whatever may be the advantages of the present system of reporting in courts of law, there are some disadvantages to counterbalance them. It needs no argument to prove that there should be free trade in reporting. Every one who thinks he can command the confidence of the profession has a right to sit in a court and take notes of what goes on there, and if he cares to do so to publish them for general use. The penalty on him if he is inaccurate in reporting legal cases will be that his work will not sell, though if he be reporting for a newspaper, the penalty if there be one, is less certain in its operation. At present we are only concerned with the former case, and, since reporters vary as other men in capacity, it is evident that if four or five sets of reports obtain the substantial support of the profession, there is

every likelihood that the reports will differ in merit, and if one set of reports could secure a preponderance of talent that they would drive the others from the field. The fact is, however, otherwise, and able and indifferent reporters seem pretty fairly balanced. Reporting is of two general kinds; there is the *verbatim* reporting and that which consists in giving a succinct account of what has occurred instead of setting out matters, arguments, and judgments at length; the latter of these under the present system is on the whole preferable, and for these reasons.

"The energy that it requires for a judge to hold his tongue" has become a proverbial saying, and, except in the rare instances where a counsel is listened to without interruption, the general tone of a judge's mind appears to the listener to be in almost every case opposed to the particular side of the question which is being supported at the time. It is natural that this should be so; the trained mind of the judge is endeavouring to pick holes in the advocacy of either side, as a means of arriving ultimately at the just conclusion between conflicting arguments. Hence remarks and scattered dicta are in verbatim reports interspersed throughout the arguments on one side or the other, frequently led up to by trains of thought common to judge and advocate, but unexpressed in words, and frequently simply interrogations which lose their character when divorced from inflexion and voice, and sometimes (for judges are human) unconsidered or petulant expressions which are produced by some passing thought. That such expressions should find their way into reports is a matter for regret; still more so when, as there is danger of their doing, they find their way into head-notes. Great judgment in such cases is required in the reporter, and the practice of lengthy verbatim reports is not the best training for such judgment. Where the dicta are incorporated in the judgment the evil of repetition arises, an evil already great enough in most cases. Thus a Court composed of four members sits in banco and delivers oral judgment in a case: at the conclusion of the argument all the judges usually take part in the decision, even where they all agree in the main. Here repetitions cannot fail to arise; indeed there are but few judges on the bench who do not repeat themselves. Are these repetitions necessary in the report?

It would, perhaps, be impossible to insist that in every case in which judgment is given there should be a written memorandum of the judgment and the reasons given by the Court, but the conclusion suggests itself that (on the common law side, at all events) it would be to the interest of the profession if in all cases of oral judgment one judge, and one only, were to give the decision of the Court, as is the case in the Privy Council. One incidental good effect of this might possibly be that more of the judgments would be considered and written, when otherwise a judge would only, as a rule, give judgment through the presiding judge.

To return from this digression, the difficulties of the reporter are by no means confined to the judgment; what is called, by courtesy, the argument generally presents more than enough—consisting, as it too often does, of mere strings of cases, bearing more or less on the subject under discussion. This is a vice which seems on the increase—the eager desire for cases may arise from defective training, from that training which consists in accumulating materials, and neglects the faculty of applying them—or it may arise from the too often repeated demand from the Bench for authority, or from a mistaken notion that it is impossible to comply with such a demand without citing a case. Whatever the reason, the substitution of cases for argument is a matter that every beginner will do well to avoid, as he is sure to do if he takes for his models the ablest, not necessarily the most successful, leaders at either Bar. Some one may be inclined to ask what advice to beginners has to do with reporting. Indirectly it has a great deal to do with the subject, since the better the argument the easier the duty of the reporter, and the



better, if he has any head on his shoulders, his report. It is in the interest of the future generation of reporters, and, therefore, of the future generation of lawyers, that this advice is given. It has been said that an artist can put no more intellect into his picture of a sitter than he himself possesses. Whether this is an extreme case or not, it applies, in a great measure, to this subject. A man must understand what goes on before him before he can interpret it for the benefit of others. This may be one reason for the assertion sometimes made that shorthand is the reverse of advantageous to reporters. Except when the familiarity with the symbols used is perfect some portion of the mind is diverted from the subject to the symbol. Where there is no such perfect familiarity, that undercurrent of the mind which is engaged in adapting or assimilating each word or idea as it is uttered to those that preceded it is broken in upon and diverted to the mere mechanical process of translating the word or idea into the symbol which is to represent it. It may be said, on the other hand, that the art of a reporter is to accumulate materials which he may arrange at a future time; but this is not the whole truth. Unless there are qualities of mind which enable him to take in at the time all the ideas and views presented, his ultimate report will be a mere *congeries* of other people's ideas taken down in and reproduced from a note-book, instead of the living resultant of the whole, fresh from his own mind. Probably, therefore, those reports are best in which there is no attempt to produce *verbatim* arguments, and in which the remarks or *dicta* of the judges are seldom to be found. The great difficulty of reports is in the head-note. Here the power or weakness of the reporter displays itself to anyone who will institute a comparison between the case as reported and the epitome of it which is termed the head-note. It may happen that a reporter may perfectly understand a case, and yet be unable to express the pith and essence of it shortly in a manner that is intelligible and clear; but this power is essential to good reporting, and is nearly as important as the accuracy, which is the first essential. As a rule the device of calling in the aid of the letters of the alphabet to explain the relative positions of the parties is an indication of the want of this power, though of course this rule is not of universal application.

Written or considered judgments of the Courts greatly facilitate the duties of a reporter, and relieve him of much responsibility, containing, as they do in general, statements of the facts on which each judgment is founded, and the arguments on which reliance is placed. From the nature of things the required head-note may frequently be found in the words of the judgment re-produced *verbatim*, and in such cases the task of reporting is of the easiest. This ought not to be advanced as an argument in favour of such judgments; but on other grounds it is much to be regretted that Courts do not, much more frequently than at present, take time to consider, or which is every bit as important, to express their judgment. It is not given to every one, not even to all judges, to express happily, and without vagueness or irrelevancy, his or their views on a question of fact depending on evidence and capable of hours of argument *pro* and *con*. It is certainly not easier where the matter is one of law, great as is the power of our judges, especially that most striking power of summing up evidence which many of them possess. Any shorthand writer's note of an oral judgment in *banco* would convince an impartial mind that there was, to say the least, danger of falling into the mistakes we have mentioned. Rapid dispatch of business is a great point, but it may sometimes be bought too dearly, and there is no disrespect to the Bench in saying that all should welcome any indication of a determination on the part of the Courts to deliver written instead of oral judgments wherever the importance of the matter warrants, or rather demands, this extra trouble, and not as now, only in those cases the solution of which is not apparent at the time, or in which there appears at the hearing to be a difference of opinion among the presiding judges.

With respect to the cases reported, the tendency is rather to report too many than too few cases. It requires both energy and independence to refuse, on your own responsibility, to report a case on the ground that it is of no importance, where another reporter takes a different view, and where the boundary line is often rather fine. In short, it is easy to find reasons why a case should be reported, and the result is too many cases which cannot be noted up. Noting up is no bad test of the value of a report.

It is obvious that with these difficulties and these requirements reporting—that is, good reporting—is no easy task. That the work can be got through on conditions much less exigent than those we have indicated is true enough, and is also plain from the unequal nature of the reports themselves; but an attempt has been made to indicate the standard at which those who intend to report—either for any reports or for their own instruction and exercise—should aim, and the standard which the profession should require. The occupation is one that forms an admirable training, but it is not perhaps of so inviting a nature that many without the sense of responsibility that attaches to reporting officially will find they have perseverance or energy to go through with it.

The reader must be left to point what moral there is in these remarks for themselves. Examples are obviously out of the question, but as good reporting is of vital importance not only to lawyers but to legislators, who should know what the existing law is before they supplement it with new law, some service will have been done if the profession have been in any way assisted in arriving for themselves at a conclusion of what does or what does not constitute a good report.

### GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

#### THE JURISDICTION OF THE COUNTY COURTS.

Sir,—In my last letter on the Jurisdiction of the County Courts, I pointed out in some detail the manifold incongruities which have been introduced into the system by successive changes of the law, and I certainly stated more than enough to prove that it was impossible, with any show of legislative consistency or common sense, to let matters remain as they are. There is no need to travel far in search of the cause of these anomalies. When, in 1846, the county courts, in their modern form, were established, the object of the experiment was to get rid of the abuses which clung, like burrs, to the old courts of request, and to set on foot a simple, cheap, and uniform mode of procedure for the recovery of "small debts and demands." A claim of £20 at common law was the limit of the jurisdiction; the judges—I speak in all respect for those able functionaries—were not, at least as a rule, selected from the leading members of the profession; the salaries were insufficient to tempt from even the back benches of Westminster Hall rising talent of a high order; and, in short, the tribunals were expected, if they were not intended, to become useful, hardworking, but somewhat "low" machines for evolving a rough and ready justice. The system came into operation, and no sooner was the gear put into good order than it was found to work smoothly, steadily, and well. The suitors appeared satisfied, and the public was loud in its praise. Confidence, which is proverbially "a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom," found, indeed, no congenial soil in the breasts of our venerable judges, who, from time to time, were wont to excite the merriment of the bar by levelling playful taunts at "county court justice;" but these very taunts were caught up by the public as indications of the way the wind was blowing, and "outsiders" were induced to suppose that tribunals used as whetstones for judicial wit must possess some dangerous merit. Men began to ask why functionaries, who were found to give satisfaction in small matters, might not be entrusted

safely with trials of more importance; and they even had the hardihood to doubt whether special pleading, which was ignored in the local courts, was really of the essence of wisdom. Ominous questions of this revolutionary nature were actually heard in the House of Lords as coming from the lips of the most eminent ex-Chancellors, and what is more, they received no satisfactory answer from any quarter. What wonder, then, that the county court, after the experience of a few years, was deemed a success? Like the tribe of Issachar, it was the "strong ass crouching down between two burdens," and almost every young legislator for the last fifteen or twenty years has thought that he was doing good service by heaping on its broad shoulders some additional load. No attempt at method, or system, or consistency was made, for unfortunately, in these days, there is no Minister of Justice, and consequently, every member of Parliament does that which is right in his own eyes. Anomalies are sown broadcast, and the country reaps its reward.

I have gone into these details respecting the rise and progress of the county court system, because they appear to me to furnish the best answer to the question of the Judicature Commissioners, whether it be desirable to *lessen* the jurisdiction of the county courts. That jurisdiction is now more than double what it originally was at common law, while a large jurisdiction in equity, admiralty, and bankruptcy proceedings has been conferred on the courts. Able judges have been appointed, the salaries have been largely augmented, the business has greatly increased, and there is not the slightest indication of any withdrawal of confidence in the courts on the part of the public. On the contrary, they now probably stand higher in popular favour than they ever have done, and he must be a bold man who, in the face of these facts, should paraphrase the language of the statesman, and declare, that, in his opinion, "the power of the county courts had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished." In my judgment the remedy for the anomalies, which I pointed out in my last letter, must be sought for in the opposite direction; and I now, therefore, proceed, with some diffidence, to furnish a rough sketch of the sort of plan which I think ought to be adopted. In the first place, I consider that the *quasi exclusive* jurisdiction of the county courts is in a very unsatisfactory state, since the law still recognizes a wide distinction between actions of tort and actions on contract. Prior to the year 1867 a man who recovered in a superior court less than £20 in an action on contract was deprived of costs, unless the judge certified in his favour; but in actions of tort a verdict for £5 carried costs. As this was shown to be a gross abuse, and to be productive of serious evils, a clause was inserted, I believe by Mr. Justice Lush, in the County Court Act of that year, which—leaving the law as to contracts in its original state—fixed the limit of damages which would carry costs in actions of tort at £10 instead of £5. The alteration, as far as it went, was highly valuable, and no doubt it has put a stop to a large number of vexatious and speculative actions. Still, it is open to the grave objection that it does not go nearly far enough. No sensible reason can be urged why any distinction should exist between torts and contracts. Since the passing of the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852, the boundary line between actions founded on tort and those on contract has been well nigh obliterated. A man detains his neighbour's goods, and an action in the superior court is the consequence. Is this detinue or trover? If the former, he will not recover costs unless the property be worth £20; if the latter, he cannot be deprived of them, should the jury consider the property as worth £10. An action against a carrier for the loss of a parcel furnishes another instance where the right to costs may depend on the skill of the pleader. But without alluding further to such suits as these, I confidently maintain that actions on tort do not in any respect involve more difficult points of law than actions on con-

tract, and that any lawyer who can deal with the one form of action will be equally competent to deal with the other. I propose, then, that the limit of exclusive jurisdiction should be made the same in either form of action, and I further propose that that limit should be fixed at £40 instead of at £20. Were the law thus modified, the judges at Westminster would be enabled to give their undivided attention to matters of real importance, while the interests of the poorer suitors would in no respect be compromised, inasmuch as every county court judge is now empowered in any case before him to grant an appeal, should he consider that course desirable (see 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142, s. 13).

In the event of the above change in the law being adopted it would become necessary to amend the Admiralty Jurisdiction Act of last year, and to confine the exclusive jurisdiction of the county courts under that statute to cases where the claim did not exceed £40. It might also, for the sake of conformity, be desirable to modify the jurisdiction of the county courts in cases of equity, so as to confer *exclusive* authority on those tribunals where the value of the property in dispute should not exceed £40; but, perhaps, this amendment would not be considered of very serious import, as few sane lawyers would advise a suit in the High Court of Chancery, unless the estate in question far exceeded in value the sum just named. Of course, in bankruptcy proceedings the limit of jurisdiction under discussion would be wholly inapplicable; but, even here, I may be permitted to doubt the wisdom of forcing all local bankruptcies into the county court, however large the estate may be, and however complicated may be the rights and liabilities of the different parties. It certainly seems impolitic to compel any persons to institute legal proceedings which must terminate in an appeal; and I am strongly inclined to hold that, in all cases where the property to be distributed under a bankruptcy is likely to exceed £5,000 or, at least, £10,000, an option should be given to the parties interested of commencing proceedings in the London Bankruptcy Court.

In my next letter I will explain my views with respect to the *concurrent* jurisdiction of the county courts.

A METROPOLITAN COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

#### "REMITTED CAUSES" IN THE COUNTY COURTS.

Sir,—A Metropolitan County Court Judge, in his letter in your last impression, has forcibly exposed the anomalies in the present system of remitting causes from the superior courts to the county courts. I trust that he will before long give us some information as to the fate of the "remitted" causes when they get into the county court. Having had occasion recently to attend a Metropolitan County Court as counsel in a remitted cause, I am somewhat anxious to know whether my experience is a common one. From the time of my arrival at two o'clock, the hour named by the registrar in the notice sent by him to the parties, until my release about five o'clock, every person to whom I mentioned my errand, from the judge, the registrar, and the habitual practitioners in the court down to the ushers, immediately remarked, "Oh, a remitted cause," in a tone of the profoundest pity for my ignorance in imagining that it could possibly be taken that day. The registrar courteously explained that the proper work of the court was as much as could be got through, and that they were quite overwhelmed by the number of causes remitted. The learned judge (a deputy, acting during the illness of the regular judge) had already sat several extra days, and I understood that he had to sit at a different court the next day. In the result my case stood over until a day late in January, long after it might have been tried if it had remained in the superior court. From the state of things at five o'clock when the list for the day was not nearly finished, and a case was being called on in which the parties were complaining that it was the second day on which they had attended, I fancy that many of the county court cases proper must have met with the same fate. I have much reason to think that the trial in the county court of the cause to which I have referred will ultimately cost as much money as well as more time and trouble to the parties than it would have if left in the superior court.

On my suggesting that the state of things I found existing ought to be made public, I was told that remonstrances had been addressed time after time to the Treasury, and other quarters. Would it not be well to address them to the authorities at Judge's chambers? While the judges and masters continue to remit causes on the barest suggestion of a jurisdiction to do so, and the judges continue to refuse to give costs by certifying that cases are fit for the superior court, even when they so far distrust their own judgment as to reserve points for the consideration of the court in banco, as I have known to be the case, can anything be expected but a block up in the county courts, as bad as there has occasionally been in the superior courts?

A JUNIOR BARRISTER.

### APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. S. BOTLER BRISTOWE, of the Midland Circuit, has been appointed Recorder of Newark. Mr. Bristowe was called to the Bar in 1848, and for some time was on the staff of the *Weekly Reporter*.

Mr. WILLIAM BROOKS MORTIMER, solicitor, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, has been appointed Registrar of the Newcastle County Court, in succession to Mr. John Clayton, resigned. The salary of the office is £8,000 a-year. Mr. Mortimer was certificated as a solicitor in Trinity Term, 1856.

Mr. SIMON DUNNING, solicitor, of Parliament-street, Westminster, has been appointed Legal Secretary to Dr. Wilberforce, the new Bishop of Winchester, recently translated from Oxford to that diocese. Mr. Dunning, who was certificated as a solicitor in Michaelmas Term, 1837, is a member of the firm of Burder & Dunning.

Mr. HENRY BERNARD, solicitor, of Wells, has been appointed Legal Secretary to the Right Rev. Lord Arthur Hervey, the newly-consecrated Bishop of the diocese of Bath and Wells. Mr. Bernard's certificate as a solicitor was issued in Hilary Term, 1838.

Mr. GEORGE GILL MOUNSEY, notary of Carlisle, has been appointed Legal Secretary to the Right Rev. Harvey Goodwin, D.D., the newly-consecrated Bishop of Carlisle. Mr. Mounsey began his legal career in Easter Term, 1818, and has been secretary to several successive Bishops of Carlisle; he also fills the office of registrar of the diocese.

Mr. RALPH ROBERT WHEELER LINGEN, barrister-at-law, now the secretary to the Committee of Council on Education, has been appointed permanent Secretary to the Treasury, in succession to the Right Hon. G. A. Hamilton, who becomes (in conjunction with the Right Hon. Judge Lawson, of the Irish bench, and Viscount Monck, a member of the Commission to settle the affairs of the Irish Church, which will be constituted at the beginning of the new year. Mr. Lingen is the only son of Mr. Thomas Lingen, of Birmingham, where he was born in 1819. Mr. Lingen was, in 1837, elected from the Bridgnorth Grammar School to an open scholarship at Trinity College, Oxford. He gained the "Ireland" scholarship in 1838, and in the following year the "Hertford"; in 1840 he obtained a first-class in *Literis Humanioribus*. He was elected to a fellowship at Balliol College in 1841, on taking his M.A. degree, together with Mr. Edward Kent Karalake, Q.C.; and in 1843, Mr. Lingen obtained the Chancellor's prize for a Latin essay, the subject of which was, "The Effect and Influence of the Public Games on the Grecian and Roman Character." In 1846 he was awarded the Eldon law scholarship, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in May of the following year. He entered the public service in 1846, being then employed by the Education Department to conduct an inquiry in South Wales; he afterwards became examiner in the same department, and on the retirement of Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth with a baronetcy, he was appointed to succeed that gentleman as Secretary to the Committee of Council on Education. Mr. Lingen will enter on his duties as Secretary to the Treasury on the 1st of January next.

Mr. FRANCIS M. BOWEY, solicitor, of Sunderland, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking affidavits to be used in the superior courts at Westminster.

Mr. HENRY CIPRIANI POTTER, of Romsey, Southampton, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

Mr. SAMUEL PRESTON, solicitor, of Hinckley, Leicester-

snire, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery, and also a commissioner for taking affidavits in the Superior Courts at Westminster.

### SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

#### METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL LAW ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of the managing committee, held on Wednesday, the 8th December, 1869, Mr. Edward Lawrance, the Chairman of the Association, in the chair, it was, on the motion of Mr. Stephen Williams, seconded by Mr. E. Benham, resolved—"That the 29th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, having rendered solicitors competent, as trustees in bankruptcy, to contract to be paid a certain sum, by way of percentage or otherwise, as a remuneration for their services as such trustees, including all professional services, the managing committee is of opinion that it would not be inconsistent with the standing of the profession for solicitors to accept such office upon such terms or arrangements as they may see fit in each particular case."

#### THE UNION OF THE TWO BRANCHES OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION CONSIDERED WITH A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO CONTEMPLATED LAW REFORMS.\*

The most characteristic feature of the present age is perhaps that spirit of free and unfettered inquiry which probes remorselessly the origin and claims of the most cherished institutions and beliefs.

Under its influence it is no longer sufficient for any system to appeal to antiquity or prescription for its retention; if it cannot give a good account of itself on its own merits the most venerable antiquity, a prescription of many centuries will not save it from adverse criticism and consequent destruction.

It is no wonder therefore, that attention should have been drawn to our complex judicial organization, hitherto regarded by many even intelligent laymen in the light of a mysterious cobweb, full of traps and entanglements, carefully preserved intact by the lawyers for their own peculiar benefit at the expense of the laity—and we must all admit that it is full time that public attention should be drawn to this subject; for, although we look back with amused wonder at the days now past when those mythic legal familiars, John Doe and Richard Roe haunted our courts with their imaginary feud, and when the mysteries of fines and recoveries, rebutters and surrebutters flourished to the "no small gain" of "the craftsmen," and plume ourselves on the fact that we are not as our fathers were—the ministering priests to such absurdities as these, yet there is much in our present laws, and particularly in that administration of them in which we take a principal part, that will not bear the rude touch of hostile questioning, but will fall to pieces at the first assault.

That our present complicated and expensive judicial organization has lasted so long is due principally to that want of scientific education on the part of the profession which has been so ably stated by Mr. Jevons of Liverpool, in the pamphlet which has excited so much interest in the profession, supplemented by the constitutional indifference and distrust with which all theoretical changes are viewed in this country, not merely by the profession, but by the general public, especially when such changes are not initiated by persons of the highest professional or political rank, for as it was wittily put by the *Times* the other day, in an article somewhat to the purpose, "a Bentham may demonstrate, but unless a Lord Chancellor nod approval nothing will be done," and unfortunately, of course, not merely Lord Chancellors, but all those exalted persons whose high standing and proved practical sagacity would give the required weight to any measures of legal reform are so occupied by the pressure of their daily work that with them practice leaves no time for theory.

Notwithstanding, however, these impediments in the way of legal reform there are now indications of forthcoming changes, which if properly matured and carried out will go far towards simplifying our judicial system and redeeming it from many of those blots and abuses which are a scandal to the jurisprudence of a civilized community.

\* A paper read by Mr. C. T. Saunders, solicitor, of Birmingham, at the annual meeting of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, held at York, on the 19th October, 1869.



I allude, of course, to the Report of the recent Judicature Commission which is, no doubt, familiar to all present, and which has probably been read by many, as it was by myself, with some disappointment, but still with considerable hope. That Commission, I cannot refrain from saying in passing, is a memorable event to our long-proscribed caste, for there sat upon it, as her Majesty's trusty and well-beloved commissioners, two country attorneys, Mr. Bateson and Mr. Lowndes, worthily representing that important city whose attorneys have exhibited so much public spirit and energy in their endeavours both to improve our legal system, and also to elevate the profession.

Let us now consider the leading features of the really revolutionary changes which the Royal Commissioners agree in suggesting for adoption. Fruitful amongst the causes which have cast discredit on our judicial system has been the severance of jurisdiction into the two great divisions of law and equity, long the wonder of foreign jurists, but the necessity for which was until lately considered as cardinal a point of belief as the separation into two distinct branches of the professors of both law and equity.

The enormous evils produced by this conflict of legal and equitable jurisdictions, the misery and ruin in which it has involved generations of unhappy suitors having been long the theme of satirists and novelists, have at last found grave and serious expression in the Judicature Commissioners' Report, which, recognising and adopting the principle laid down by their predecessors in 1850 that "a consolidation of all the elements of a complete remedy in the same court is obviously desirable, not to say imperatively necessary, to the establishment of a consistent and rational system of procedure," boldly recommends the complete fusion of the two jurisdictions.

Less mischievous in practice from their virtually concurrent jurisdiction, but perhaps even more indefensible in theory is the separate existence of the several Superior Courts of Common Law, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, those fossil remains of a primeval legal age, the continuation of which, although not productive of the gigantic evils attendant upon the separation of law and equity is still full of minor but collectively very serious inconveniences.

Following, however, in the wake of, and as an almost necessary accompaniment to, the foregoing organic reform, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer are—if the recommendations of the Commissioners be carried out—to disappear as separate courts, although it is fondly supposed by the eminent persons forming the Commission that the country is so much attached to these venerable names that the shock would be too great to part with them at once (excess of joy it is said is as fatal as excess of sorrow), and, therefore, they propose to keep their memories green in conjunction with the still more fragrant name of Chancery by converting the same courts into so many chambers or divisions of one supreme court. Better by far bury them and the miseries of which they have been the fruitful cause, far out of our own and our children's sight and, if possible, memories for ever.

The above two great reforms—the fusion of law and equity and the consolidation of all the superior courts of law, including the separate jurisdictions of Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty are distinctly recommended, but on two subjects, only second in importance, I mean the Nisi Prius and Circuit System and the Law of Appeals, the Commissioners speak with a somewhat uncertain voice in consequence of the limited extent of their Commission. A fresh Commission has, however, since been issued with powers comprehensive enough to entertain these questions, and it is important that such an association as this should exercise its legitimate influence upon their deliberations.

The opinion of the public, and, I may say I believe, of the principal law societies—certainly the Provincial Law Societies—upon these two undetermined, but most important, subjects, has been already expressed, and with a general unanimity in favour of the following changes as essential to complete any scheme of large and comprehensive reform in our judicature system. They are—

Firstly. The establishment of Provincial Courts of the First Instance throughout the country with districts assigned to them, after the manner of the existing District Bankruptcy or Probate Courts, having their head quarters or registries for the issue of all processes and filing of pleadings, hearing of all applications for time or otherwise in the great centres of population, presided over by

judges of the first eminence and with competent registrars, the judges to be either locally situate as the Bankruptcy Commissioners and county court judges are, or, better still, perhaps, itinerant and holding at least quarterly sittings at the most important towns within each district, and having jurisdiction in all cases not within the present enforced limits of the county courts jurisdictions. This plan, or the outline of it, is indeed suggested as an alternative one in a joint note to the aforesaid Report signed by Mr. Justice Smith and the present Solicitor-General, Sir J. D. Coleridge, and it would be preferable to the other plan which has been mooted—viz., that of increasing the jurisdiction of the County Courts, so as to embrace all subjects of litigation, whatever the amount at stake, unless the constitution and mode of procedure in such courts were remodelled; and it is also preferable to the plan of establishing what the Commissioners call a supreme court, whose head quarters would be in London, and whose judges would go circuits somewhat after the present manner, but at more frequent intervals, although even with this plan provincial registries might, after the manner of the district registries of the Probate Court, be still secured.

If the country, and particularly the commercial part of the community, were but alive to the vast saving of time and money which would result from localising the various proceedings in an action from writ to execution, instead of it being necessary as at present to take every step, however unimportant, in the metropolis, it would not be long before the present utterly absurd and indefensible system went the way of the many other legal anomalies which have succumbed to the assault of common sense.

Secondly. The establishment of one final court of appeal composed of judges generally, but not necessarily, promoted for distinguished judicial eminence from the courts below.

Our present law of appeal is at once irrational in theory and ruinous in practice, but its inconsistent and absurd anomalies are now so generally acknowledged that it is unnecessary for me to detail them.

Such being the main features of the startling reforms which we may shortly expect—for events move very rapidly in these days—what will be their effect upon the profession itself?

It will evidently work a revolution in the bar.

In the first place, there will be an end at once to the distinction which exists between the common law and equity bar. Each advocate must have that general knowledge which will enable him to plead in all cases before the courts, and to qualify himself for a seat on that judicial bench, where he will have to adjudicate upon all litigated subjects alike.

Secondly. The localising of all litigation, except appeals, will oblige the bar to break up that central organization which has been the mainstay of their power and influence, and settle down in batches in the country towns or else abandon the courts of the first instance to the attorneys, as they have been obliged to do the bankruptcy and county courts and confine themselves to the courts of appeal.

But is it probable when the public attention, excited by such changes as these, is directed to the subject that the present artificial division of the profession into two branches, which has been a part of the old order of things, and which has had some warrant for its existence in the equally artificial divisions of the system under which it has flourished, will continue any longer to exist?

The subject is one of great interest, and has been brought, during the past twelve months, into more prominent notice and discussion than it has ever yet been, by reason of the outspoken and decided views of so high an authority as Mr. Justice Hannen, and the movement consequent thereon in the profession, and the comments of the public press; and men inside, and outside too, of the profession are, in the general upheaval of the foundations of our judicial organisation, beginning to ask on what foundation does the Bar monopoly rest, sole remaining relic as it is, of those curious trade guilds, the protection and exclusive privileges of which, once considered so necessary, have long since been condemned by truer principles of political economy as radically bad and inconsistent with the public good, and the first time the question is asked in the proper place, it is elicited that there is no legal foundation whatever for it, but that the whole superstructure rests upon the custom of the courts, and legal etiquette. I allude, of course, to the reply of the Home Secretary to the questions put by Mr. Fawcett and others in the House of Commons,

when the Overend and Gurney prosecution was on the point of being abandoned through the stringent influence of the existing rules, whereby Mr. Lewis, undeniably the fittest man for the work, was barred from the further conduct of the case.

Can there be a doubt that a privileged institution, having no better foundation than this, would have long since disappeared, but for the circumstance that those most interested in its maintenance have always held paramount influence in the Legislature. And when the range of vision is extended from the narrow limits of our island to the practices of other nations, what do we find? This striking fact, that in no other civilised country but one, is there any approach to such a system, and in none a counter-part to it, that in Sweden and Denmark; throughout the length and breadth of Germany in all its separate governments; in Italy, Spain, and Portugal, the functions of the attorney and the advocate are combined; and that in France, the only apparent exception, the relations of the advocate to the *avocat* (who, to only a partial extent occupies the position of an attorney) and to the client differs in those points which are considered essential in our system; and more striking still, that in the vast empire of the United States, governed by English laws, filled by our own race, and holding many of our legal traditions; and in all our colonial dependencies, no such severance of the two branches of the profession exists.

Now, in the face of these facts, which lie at the very threshold of the argument, what are the reasons which are considered to justify the maintenance of this peculiar and anomalous system?

The most striking argument, and the one that has been most persistently advanced in its favour, is the alleged necessity for a division of labour, and the superior excellence in special knowledge attained thereby, as evidenced by the severance of the common law and chancery bar and the status of the pure conveyancer.

Now, I do not deny that this argument is one possessing considerable weight, but its importance has been much overrated, and the approaching fusion of law and equity will probably soon deprive it of its most forcible illustration, for the distinction between the common law and chancery barristers must then necessarily cease.

As concerns the pure conveyancer who never goes into court there is no appreciable difference between him and a high class conveyancing attorney who never issues a writ, and the genus will exist alike under either system: his status may, however, be noticed for the example which it affords of the convenience of extending the right of audience before the courts to all branches of the profession whether specially devoted to advocacy or not. A Joshua Williams, for example, would probably be dismayed at the prospect of undertaking the examination of a difficult witness, but he is brought down to Westminster with great effect to argue an abstruse point of real property law. The common law and chancery bar being merged, there will remain, as the only important division of labour, that which exists between the advocate generally and the attorney—i.e., between the person who prepares the case for trial and the person who conducts it in court, and it is gravely asserted that there is such a vital difference between the qualities of mind required for the two operations that they must be kept separate. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, in the best article that I have yet seen on the other side of the question, goes so far as to say that no two pursuits relating to the same subject can well be more distinct than advocacy and getting up a case for trial. Now, of course, a man may have the perseverance, shrewdness, and tact required for skillfully getting up a difficult case for trial, and may be, notwithstanding, very deficient in the qualities required to form a good advocate, but, on the other hand, he may just as likely as not have the gift of advocacy sufficiently developed in him to enable him to conduct the case to the end with effect; and so far from the pursuits being irreconcilable, it would seem to an ordinary understanding not affected by the inevitable bias of professional usage, that to conduct a case at the trial is the natural and legitimate sequence to superintending or personally directing its course up to that period.

But it has been said, and with some force, that there will necessarily be many cases in which the practitioner, however well qualified to get up the case, will not have the advocate's quality developed, and that in such cases he must entrust the case to another who is so gifted, and that then

there will be the same division of labour as at present, with some objections from which the present system is free.

Now, in considering this fair retort, it will be convenient to inquire how the profession would be likely to shape itself to the altered practice consequent upon amalgamation—probably as follows: there would be a greater tendency in practitioners to exclusively devote themselves to litigious or court practice on the one hand, and to conveyancing on the other; and, in passing, I just note that inasmuch as court practice would be the most frequent avenue to distinction the highest class of practitioners, the most gifted in intellectual power, would devote themselves to it, and there would be a greater development of partnership arrangements by which different classes of practice would be conducted, as in fact they so frequently are now, by different partners, and which in the event of the common law partner being unqualified for advocacy would include within the firm a partner who was so qualified.

Even the Inns of Court Commissioners of 1855 had a glimmering suspicion that such an obvious and sensible arrangement would be far more convenient for the public, for in examining Mr. Cookson, after referring to the improved education of the attorneys and the defective education of the bar, they proceeded to question him as to the propriety of the present division of labour, and on his replying that he believed that if the profession were united, one man would devote himself to court practice and another to conveyancing, &c., they proceeded to ask him "Would not that be a much more eligible arrangement for the client than the present, according to which a solicitor, however gifted, cannot transact the most common matter of business in court without calling in the aid of a person perhaps less educated than himself?" and on Mr. Cookson remarking that it would not be possible for the same practitioner to practice extensively in both branches, they press the point still closer by suggesting "Might not it be done by means of partnerships, one partner taking the court business, and the other the chancery business?" This is the successfully adopted practice throughout the vast English-speaking, English-law-governed United States of America.

Two American lawyers gave evidence before the same Inns of Court Commissioners of the working of this system, and I will quote from the answers of one of them a passage which should re-assure the minds of those who so strenuously support the separate existence of the bar, on the ground of the division of labour. He says—"There are many eminent men of legal knowledge who have devoted themselves to the business of conveyancing who never appear in court at all, but who may appear where they please; then there are others who do nothing but appear in court constantly; and there are men of large legal attainments who remain in their offices all the time, and prepare the cases for others, so that practically the bar divides itself to suit the circumstances of the case, although the lines are not so distinctly marked out as if they were recognised by law."

That this blending of both branches of the profession in America does not lower either the social status or the legal excellence of the profession is abundantly clear. The observations of Sir Charles Lyell on this point were read before this Association many years ago by Mr. Edwin Field in one of his formidable raids on the bar monopoly, but they are so important that I must give an extract from them:—He says, "The profession of the law is, of all others in the United States, that which attracts to it the greatest number of able and highly educated men. Practically there is much the same subdivision of labour in the legal profession here as in England. There are, however, no two grades here corresponding to barrister and attorney. Every lawyer in the United States may plead in court and address a jury; and, if he be successful, may be raised to the bench; but he must qualify as a counsellor in order to be entitled to plead in the supreme courts, where cases are heard involving points at issue between the tribunals of independent States." (This is now no longer the case I believe.) The line drawn between barrister and attorney in Great Britain, which never existed even in colonial times, in Massachusetts, could only be tolerated in a country where the aristocratic element is exceedingly predominant. In the English Church where seats in the House of Lords are held by bishops, we see how the rank of a whole profession may be elevated by making high distinctions, conferred only on a few, open to all. That in like manner the highest honours of the bar and bench might be open without detriment to the most numerous class of

legal practitioners in Great Britain seems to be proved by the fact, that occasionally some attorneys of talent, by quitting their original line of practice and starting anew, can attain the highest rank. And when we consider the confidential nature of the business transacted by English attorneys; the extent of property committed to their charge; the manner in which they are consulted in family affairs of the utmost delicacy, as in the forming of marriage contracts and wills; we may well question the policy of erecting an artificial line of demarcation between them and the advocates, marked enough to depress their social rank, and to deter many young men of good families, who can best afford to obtain a liberal education, from entering in reality the most important branch of the profession."

We may, therefore, I think, assume that, as regards conveyancing, which, however, is rather beside my subject, there would be the same class of exclusive practitioners as is now represented by the conveyancer at or under the bar, and the pure conveyancing attorney, and with no diminution in, at all events, a sufficiently profound knowledge of real property law to carry on the conveyancing business of the county with success. With regard to court practice as a rule, with for the present considerable, but in the future rare, exceptions, that would be undertaken by the same practitioner from the issue of the writ to the trial and concluding process, and in the majority of those cases in which the advocacy in court was severed, the same would be undertaken by another member of the firm. In the remaining cases an advocate would be retained, and the only objection I have heard to this branch of the argument is, the narrow and supremely selfish one, that a single practitioner who cannot plead in court may have to appear in an unfair light to his client when contrasted with his more gifted brother, who the next time an action has to be tried for the same client, may seduce him from his proper allegiance.

Of course there will be clients as now—half of us in the room have such,—who will go to a young and active common law man for their writs and trials, and to a staid conveyancing man for their wills and purchase-deeds, and if they are so unfortunate as to require it, to a clever bankruptcy practitioner to arrange their affairs; but this will cut all ways, and work no disadvantage in the long run; and if there were anything in the point it is unworthy of being raised in the discussion of such a question as this.

My reply, therefore, to the retort that there would exist the same division of labour as now, and that it would be accompanied by objections not existing now, is first, that the division of labour would be principally confined to the difference between court practice and conveyancing, which in the face of the existing division at the bar between the same practitioners, could not be held to require or warrant the existence of separate orders; secondly, that the functions of the advocate and the preparer of the case for trial not being in their essence incongruous, but ordinarily and most naturally co-existent, the difference between them would to a great extent cease when the bar was thrown open and a career of distinction opened up to the successful practitioner, and that the successful union of the two qualities and duties in the same person must be more beneficial to the suitor, both as being more conducive to the successful conduct of the case to the end, as also from being necessarily far less expensive in actual cost, and far more advantageous in point of economy of time, and, lastly, that in the remaining cases, the severance of the two functions would present no practical difficulty.

Is it not more rational, therefore, to have no such artificial barrier as that which exists between the advocate and the attorney, but to leave it to the process of natural selection to determine the employment of another person to conduct the trial, either instead of, or jointly with, the one who has worked it up and made it his own up to that point, for "there is between the duties of an advocate and attorney," in Mr. Justice Hannen's own judicial words, "no sharp dividing line; the duties merge into one another; and a man who begins his career does not know until he has been practising for years for what he may have the greatest fitness"; and I believe, to continue his language, that "it would be well to leave it to a man to find out the opportunities that may arise of calling forth the particular qualities and talents that are in him, and so leave it to such occasions to develop whether or not he has a better opportunity for carrying on the business of a solicitor than the profession of an advocate."

And now having examined, and I hope disposed of this apparently formidable argument of the division of labour, let us consider another argument which has been advanced in opposition to the amalgamation with scarcely less confidence as one affecting the purity of the administration of justice.

It is urged that the attorney having been engaged in the case from the commencement has too great an interest in it to treat it in that serene and philosophic manner which is alone proper and decorous in the superior courts of law, and that the barrister is often obliged to check the eagerness of the attorney, which sometimes leads him to interfere in the conduct of the case, and I find an old fellow-debater, Mr. Sydney Gedge, of London, in a recent speech at a meeting of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, in commenting upon Mr. Justice Hannen's liberal address of the previous year, arguing that the further the client is removed from the advocate the better, and that he had "seen attorneys shake their fists at each other," but he had "never seen barristers do this," and so on. Now I have, I hope, demonstrated that we have both reason and authority for holding that there is no natural barrier between the functions of the attorney in preparing a case for trial, and the functions of an advocate in conducting it on the trial, and I maintain most unreservedly, and in direct opposition to the objection we are now considering, that if the attorney have the requisite natural qualities for a successful advocate, he is by that very intimate knowledge of the case, from the first, which he alone possesses, from that very personal acquaintance with the actors in the legal drama, the parties, their witnesses, and the whole surroundings and "ins and outs," so to speak, of the case, all the better fitted to conduct it through the stormy waters of the trial, and with a far better chance of successfully voyaging it into a secure haven. Granted that he may be betrayed into indiscretions by his hearty zeal for his client who is to him a living verity, with rights to assert, or wrongs to redress, and whom he cannot look upon as a cold A. B. abstraction,—I say that any such indiscretions or such ebullitions of zeal are drawbacks the most insignificant compared with the unquestionable advantages to which I have referred, and that for one case which has been thereby lost, there have been twenty lost for want at a pinch or sudden turn of the case of that thorough knowledge of its details with which the attorney is saturated, but with which the advocate is necessarily only imperfectly acquainted.

Even in France, the only country in Europe, besides our own, where there is any semblance of the same distinctive orders as with us, the advocate himself examines the parties and their witnesses, and superintends the getting-up of the case, the *avoué's* part in the proceedings being comparatively slight.

And the light in which this prudish argument is regarded by the legal mind, unbiassed by the exigencies of defending our peculiar institution, is shown by the following extract from a letter which I received some time since from an eminent North German practitioner, Dr. Pavenstaet, of Bremen, who, in answer to my inquiry on this point, after stating the absence of any distinction between the advocate and the *anwalt* or attorney, says, "We consider it of the first importance, that the client should always communicate direct with the advocate who is to plead for him in court, as instructions transmitted through the medium of a third person, can never be so complete and thorough as those which are given by means of oral communications."

But the principle involved in each of these two important arguments—viz., the necessity for a division of labour between the attorney and the advocate, from the incongruity of their respective functions, and the impropriety of a direct communication between the advocate and the client and witnesses, has been abandoned by the direct act of the Legislature, and without, so far as is known, any evil consequences resulting therefrom. Attorneys are entitled by legislative enactments to act as advocates in the Bankruptcy Courts, in which estates of great magnitude, involving intricate questions of law and fact, are constantly administered, and in which the character, honour, and future prospects in life of individuals are at stake. Has it been found an advantage or not in the discovery of frauds in the unravelling of involved accounts in the interests of public justice generally that a Lawrance or a Linklater has had the opportunity of direct communication with the parties and personal investigation of the facts in a particular case.

By other legislative enactments they are also entitled to



plead, and are virtually the sole pleaders in the County Courts with their now manifold jurisdictions? Jurisdiction in actions of contract enforced at the plaintiff's option up to £50, and without limit by consent; a jurisdiction in those most important of all cases, real property actions, up to £20 per annum equivalent to from £400 to £600 in value according to the nature of the property; a jurisdiction in equity up to £500; and still more recently a jurisdiction in admiralty up to £300 in amount; and the statistics of last year disclose the extraordinary fact that while the enormous amount of upwards of two millions and a-half was sued for in these courts in that year, in one half of the *Nisi Prius* trials, during the same period, the amount at stake did not exceed the £50 county court limit in actions of contract and in only 163 trials did the amount involved exceed £500, the limit of the equity jurisdiction in such courts. The above facts show forcibly how restricted in their application the arguments of the defenders of the present exclusive system have become; the ground is indeed gradually being taken from under their feet, for it surely needs no argument to prove that the principle involved is the same in the cases within as without the county court jurisdiction.

Another objection which has found some supporters and should, therefore, be noticed, is this, that there would not be the same attention paid to the study of the principles of law, and that we should not, therefore, have such great lawyers as heretofore. Now, in the first place, I cannot admit that under the existing system there has been a proper attention paid to the study of the principles of law and jurisprudence. We have had great lawyers it is true, but they have been great in spite, and not in consequence of the existing order of things. But in refutation of the argument that there would be a falling off in the theoretical study of the law and the production of great lawyers, I must, again, point to our brethren in profession and race in the States. Have no great jurists or text writers been produced there? I might enumerate as illustrious a roll of names as during the same period could be exhibited by our own country, and I am justified by the expressed opinion of a great American lawyer that it is to the practical knowledge of the defects of their legal procedure, which many of their eminent men acquired by practising as attorneys, that they owe the earlier introduction of those great reforms in their judicature, which we are even now but dimly apprehending. But, further, and as a final reply to this depressing argument, it cannot be supposed that our present system of legal education will continue. Whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the subject we are now considering, there is, I hope, but one opinion as to the necessity for establishing a Law University, through whose portals all future students must pass, and by means of which the scientific study of the law will be largely promoted and encouraged.

There is one last practical, although transitory, objection, which I shall notice, and it admits of a short reply.

It is said, on the part of the bar, how unfair it will be to admit the whole body of the attorneys at once to practice on an equality with them. It has been said by some attorneys how unfair it will be to admit the bar without examinations to inundate the country to their probable loss.

There are, I should suppose, upon a fair estimate, about fifteen hundred barristers or one-third of their gross number in the active pursuit of their profession, the rest are either only nominal members of the bar or are filling some of the multitudinous offices at home or abroad open to them. Of these fifteen hundred one-half may be said to have made a recognised position and name, the remaining moiety have not yet done so.

As regards the former the amalgamation would work no injury, the prestige in favour of their well-known names would continue undiminished under the new dispensation. As regards the less fortunate ones, their prospects might suffer, but they would have the great countervailing advantage of being able to practice at large, free, and it must be a great satisfaction to them from what Sir Robert Phillimore called, in his evidence before the Commission of 1855, the *malignant* influence of the attorneys.

As concerns the attorneys they need not fear the competition of the bar, in what has hitherto been their own peculiar walk. Those men, whose well-known fame alone would be dangerous, will never deign or need to practice anything but pure advocacy. The residue, at the utmost, some one thousand strong, need not, when distributed throughout the country, excite their apprehension.

Concerning the supposed practical inconveniences in the way of carrying out so great a change, these will not, on consideration, be found to present any insuperable difficulty; of course, no great reforms can be carried out without some difficulty and more or less hardship to individuals. In the first place every barrister who has already been called must be admitted to the entire practice of the united profession. I have shown how small a proportion of them will avail themselves of this latitude, and we must concede this point in return for the equally important privilege which must be granted to the attorneys, now on the roll, that of being admitted to the right of pleading in all the superior courts and eligible for all judicial and legal appointments, subject to this exception, which may be made in deference to the supposed inferior acquaintance of attorneys with the principles of law—viz., inasmuch as it will be a work of time to carry out the proposed university and to reap the advantage of its higher legal training, the right of pleading in the supreme court of appeal might be limited to barristers of five years' standing and attorneys of ten years' standing (in Scotland a W. S. of ten years' standing is eligible to the judicial bench), but with this stipulation that the holder of the superior decree of Doctor of Laws in the new university, which will entail severer examinations, may plead at any time; such provisions would effectually fence in the dignity of the highest court; and ensure at once a competent and experienced bar, whether the right of pleading in such court should ultimately be confined to the holders of the highest degree—I need not now discuss.

I have now, I think, exhausted the objections and difficulties both of principle and detail to the proposed amalgamation, and what do they all collectively amount to? are they worthy to be weighed in the balance with the great and unquestionable advantage to the public and the profession, particularly our branch of it, which will result from the amalgamation? I have been already obliged incidentally to refer to some of the points in which the public would be the gainer. And the question from this stand-point is very ably treated by one of the most thoughtful of our periodicals, the *Spectator*, in a recent article, in which the writer, in speaking of the proposed university for the students of each branch of the profession, without further providing for the amalgamation, contends that it is that which the public interest demands, and referring to the clever but hollow argument in the *Full Mail Gazette*, he proceeds:—"The injustice of excluding attorneys from all the chief legal appointments is no doubt felt by them alone, but it is none the less real, and it carries with it a diminution of social status which is a clog upon the whole of that branch of the profession. It is said that the attorney makes up for this by earning money more quickly than the barrister, and that the barrister ought to be rewarded for his early disappointments by 'high patronage late in life.'" It might be better if the barrister could also earn money when he was young, and yet there would be no reason why he should forfeit his subsequent chance of patronage. If a man is fit for both, why is he to be restricted to one? Why is he to remain idle in youth, or be incapable of a rise in manhood, unless it be for the public interest that tried ability should not have the stimulus of hope, and growing ability should be pressed down under the load of disappointment, and he concludes—"The real point to be considered is the public interest. Would the legal work of the country be better or worse done if these arbitrary distinctions were abolished? We think it would be done better. Of course a solicitor may feel that he is unfitted to argue a case, just as a barrister may feel that he is unfitted to get up the necessary evidence. But the converse may sometimes occur. An attorney may learn by experience that he is more fitted for work in court than for office work, and a barrister may find that his presence of mind always deserts him as soon as he is on his legs. It is all very well to say that both branches of the profession are open to all the world; but a man who has committed himself to one does not care to throw away all his time and money and start afresh in the other."

And what, lastly, shall I say of its effect on us, what is our present position, and what are our prospects? It is not sufficiently considered how small a part of the legal business of this country is litigious, nor how vast are the interests, how important and numerous the subjects involving legal assistance which are constantly engaging the watchful care and superintendence of the attorneys of this kingdom with

comparatively little interference or assistance from the bar; even of litigious matters it is almost incredible how small a proportion proceed to that stage in which the assistance of an advocate is necessary. There were last year alone 900,000 county court summonses, in how many of them would a barrister have been engaged? There were 82,000 writs issued out of the superior courts, but only 2 per cent. went to trial, and necessarily involved the interference of counsel, the remaining 98 per cent. were dealt with and settled by the attorney without any advocacy being called into requisition. The attorney's general education is as good as his professional education is a great deal better than that of the majority of the bar. His influence is scattered broadcast through the land, and is practically unbounded, and yet what are his prospects, of any high advancement! Because by a long series of encroachments, but by no legislative enactments he has been deprived of his ancient privilege of pleading in court, of being a member of the great Inns, in whom such right has by custom become vested; because at the last stage in such of the manifold businesses entrusted to him as require judicial decision, his mouth is stopped and he is obliged to retain a deputy to speak for him, he is excluded from all high legal and judicial appointments; he has before him as a reward of the most diligent study, of the highest legal attainments, no prize or distinction whatever, all these being appropriated by virtue of the exercise of that single function of pleading at the bar of the superior courts by the other branch of the profession. As another able writer of the outside public says in a recent article in the *Fortnightly Review*, in which the absurdities of the present system are fully exposed:—

"The present arrangement of the legal profession cuts off from a fair career one whole branch of its members, attorneys are allowed to grow rich, but they are allowed no other prize of legal success; there is perhaps no other profession pursued by persons in the position of gentlemen which offers no public prizes as a reward for eminence."

To unite the two branches of the profession, especially when supplemented as it must be by a law university, would be to lift up the attorneys as a body in social status and national importance; it would remove from us that rankling sense of injustice under which we must always otherwise exist.

It would open up the entire profession to the higher classes, who are now deterred from sending their sons into this the most important and by far the most numerous branch, by the existence of those disqualifications for legal and judicial rank of which we now so justly complain. This again would re-act upon and elevate the tone and character of the members of the profession who, having before them as the legitimate reward of ability and hard work the great prizes of the profession, would thereby be stimulated to greater excellence.

There is, therefore, in conclusion, no foundation for the charge that we wish from jealous rivalry to "pull down the bar," as it has been said "to our level," and that by so doing the character and tone of the profession will be lowered; but we do wish, while acknowledging the high and honourable traits of character which have always distinguished the English advocate, and while desirous that the great change shall be made with as much regard as possible to vested interests, to remove an invidious and artificial barrier which equals in rigid exclusiveness the worst form of caste and perpetuates distinctions, the reason and necessity for which have ceased with the improved social and professional status of attorneys, and in seeking to accomplish this end so far from lowering the character of the profession, we believe that by freeing it from the arbitrary rules of an antiquated etiquette, and placing its relations to its own members upon a fair and rational basis, we shall at the same time promote the interests of the public, and enhance the dignity and importance of our learned profession.

## OBITUARY.

### MR. HENRY JACOBS.

Mr. Henry Jacobs, who had, owing to his great age and infirmities, just resigned the office of Clerk to the Magistrates of the City of Oxford, died there on the 16th December. Mr. Jacobs was originally clerk to Mr. Robertson, Town Clerk of Oxford, and had discharged the duties of magistrates' clerk for upwards of thirty-four years, so

that his official career embraced about half a-century. He had likewise filled the office of Clerk to the Oxford Board of Guardians, in conjunction with his other duties, for a period of forty years. His long experience in connection with the administration of criminal law, with which he had a most extensive acquaintance, and his knowledge of the details of the working of the poor law system, rendered him a valuable officer to the two bodies with which he had been so long associated. The chairman of the guardians testified that Mr. Jacobs had always been most anxious to keep down the legal expenses of the board, and few unions could be cited which had been kept so free from law costs. Mr. Jacobs was seventy-nine years of age at the time of his death.

### MR. RICHARD THOMPSON.

The death of Mr. Richard Thompson, solicitor, of Durham, and Clerk to the Board of Guardians of that city, took place suddenly on the 13th December, at his residence in Old Elvet, at the age of 59 years. The late Mr. Thompson commenced practice at Durham in 1829, in Michaelmas Term of which year he was certificated as a solicitor, and had been for the last few years Clerk to the Durham Board of Guardians and Assessment Committee. Previously to accepting this office Mr. Thompson had taken an active part in the municipal affairs of Durham, and on one occasion filled the office of Mayor of that city. Since 1869, Mr. Thompson had been in partnership with Mr. William Lisle, the firm being known as Thompson & Lisle.

## LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

### EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

*Michaelmas Term, 1869.*

#### FINAL EXAMINATION

At the examination of candidates for admission on the roll of attorneys and solicitors of the superior courts, the examiners recommended the following gentlemen, under the age of 26, as being entitled to honorary distinction:—

HENRY SUMMERS SEWELL, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Hoyle, Shipley, & Hoyle, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and Messrs. Hill & Hoyle, of London.

WILLIAM FREDERICK BEARDSLEY, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Tallents, Burnaby, Griffin, & Co., of Newark; and Messrs. De Gex & Harding, of London.

FRANCIS WILLIAM SANCROFT DAMANT, who served his clerkship to Mr. Henry James Damant, of Cowes, Isle of Wight; and Tamworth, Staffordshire.

JOHN RAYNER COOPER, who served his clerkship to Mr. Thomas Harland, of Bridlington; and Messrs. Lee, Collyer, Bristow, Withers, & Russell, of London.

THEODORE LUMLEY, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Lumley & Lumley, of London.

CHARLES CORNISH BROWN, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Farnell & Brown, of Bristol; and Messrs. Gamlen & Son of London.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly awarded the following prizes of books:—

To Mr. Sewell, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's-inn.

To Mr. Beardsley, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clement's-inn.

To Mr. Damant, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Lumley, and Mr. Brown, prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

The examiners also certified that the following candidates, under the age of 26, whose names are placed in alphabetical order, passed examinations which entitle them to commendation:—

JOHN SEYMOUR FOWLER, who served his clerkship to Mr. Alexander Burnes Anderson, of Liverpool; and Messrs. Torr, Janeway, & Tagart, of London.

ARTHUR CRABTREE PROCTER, who served his clerkship to Mr. Charles Edward Procter, of Macclesfield; and Messrs. John & Charles Cole, of London.

EDMUND THEODORE RATCLIFF, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Alcock & Millward, of Birmingham; and Messrs. Torr, Janeway, & Tagart, of London.

HIGSON SIMPSON, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Grange & Wintringham, of Great Grimsby; and Messrs. Belfrage & Middleton, of London.

The council have accordingly awarded them certificates of merit.

The examiners further announced to the following candidates that their answers to the questions at the examination were highly satisfactory, and would have entitled them to certificates of merit if they had not been above the age of 26:—

WILLIAM BOYCOTT, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Gardner & Lander, of Rugeley.

GEORGE STUART EVETT, B.A., who served his clerkship to Mr. Henry Raper George Fowkes, of London.

ROBERT MARTIN, who served his clerkship to Mr. Sheldon Dudley Ashby, of London.

JAMES MIDGLEY, who served his clerkship to Mr. Richard Ludlam Rooke, of Leeds.

GEORGE PRESSWELL, who served his clerkship to Mr. Jabez McDiarmid, of London.

The examiners also reported that among the candidates from Liverpool in the year 1869, Mr. J. S. Fowler, passed the best examination, and was, in the opinion of the examiners, entitled to honorary distinction; that Mr. M. P. Jones, and Mr. J. W. Alsop, B.A., were respectively second and third in order of merit among the candidates from Liverpool in the year 1869, and were, in their opinion, entitled to honorary distinction.

The council have therefore awarded to Mr. Fowler, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Alsop, respectively, the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Timpron Martin, of Liverpool.

The gold medal founded by Mr. John Atkinson, for candidates from Liverpool or Preston, who have shown themselves best acquainted with the Law of Real Property and the Practice of Conveyancing, has been also awarded to Mr. Fowler, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Alsop respectively. (The prizes awarded to Mr. Jones, and Mr. Alsop were withheld in the years 1867 and 1868.)

The examiners also reported that among the candidates from Birmingham in the year 1869, Mr. E. T. Ratcliff was entitled to honorary distinction.

The council have accordingly communicated this report to the Birmingham Law Society.

Mr. Courtney Stanhope Kenny, having, among the candidates in the year 1869, shewn himself best acquainted with the Law of Real Property and the Practice of Conveyancing, the council have awarded to him the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Francis Broderip, of Lincoln's Inn.

The number of candidates examined in this term was 120; of these 113 passed and 7 were postponed.

## COURT PAPERS.

### COURT OF CHANCERY.

#### SITTINGS IN HILARY TERM, 1870.

##### LORD CHANCELLOR.

###### Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Jan. 11 } Appeals.  
Wednesday, 12 }  
Thursday, 13 }  
Friday, 14 } App. mtns., petns.,  
                  & apps.  
Saturday, 15 }  
Monday, 17 }  
Tuesday, 18 } Appeals.  
Wednesday, 19 }  
Thursday, 20 }  
Friday, 21 } App. mtns. & apps.  
Saturday, 22 }  
Monday, 24 }  
Tuesday, 25 } Appeals.  
Wednesday, 26 }  
Thursday, 27 }  
Friday, 28 }  
Saturday, 29 } Petitions and apps.  
Monday, 31 } App. mtns. & apps.

##### MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

###### Chancery-lane.

Tuesday, Jan. 11 } Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Wednesday, 12 }  
Thursday, 13 } General paper.  
Friday, 14 }  
Saturday, 15 } Petns., sht. causes,  
                  adj. sums., and  
                  general paper.  
Monday, 17 }  
Tuesday, 18 } General paper.  
Wednesday, 19 }  
Thursday, 20 } Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday, 21 } General paper.

Saturday, 22 } Petns., sht. caus.,  
                  adj. sums., and  
                  general paper.  
Monday, 24 }  
Tuesday, 25 } General paper.  
Wednesday, 26 }  
Thursday, 27 }  
Friday, 28 }  
Saturday, 29 } Petns., sht. caus.,  
                  adj. sums., and  
                  general paper.  
Monday, 31 } Mtns. & gen. papr.

N.B.—Unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

##### LORD JUSTICE GIFFARD.

###### Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Jan. 11 }  
Wednesday, 12 } Appeal Court.  
Thursday, 13 }  
Friday, 14 } Appeal motions.  
                  { Petns. in lunacy,  
Saturday, 15 } { bankrupt appeals,  
                  { and app. petitions.  
Monday, 17 } Appeal Court.  
Tuesday, 18 } App. from the  
                  County Palatine of  
                  Lancaster.

Wednesday, 19 } Appeal Court.  
Thursday, 20 }  
Friday, 21 } Appeal motions.  
Saturday, 22 } Petns. in lunacy,  
                  { bkript. apps., and  
                  { appeal petitions.  
Monday, 24 }  
Tuesday, 25 }  
Wednesday, 26 } Appeal Court.  
Thursday, 27 }  
Friday, 28 }  
Saturday, 29 } Petns. in lunacy  
                  { bkript. apps., and  
                  { appeal petitions.  
Monday, 31 } Appeal motions.

NOTICE.—The days (if any) on which the Lord Justice shall be sitting with the Lord Chancellor, or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

##### V. C. SIR JOHN STUART.

###### Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Jan. 11 } Mtns. & causes.  
Wednesday, 12 } Causes.  
Thursday, 13 }  
Friday, 14 } Petns. and causes.  
Saturday, 15 } Sht. causes & caus.  
Monday, 17 }  
Tuesday, 18 } Causes.  
Wednesday, 19 }  
Thursday, 20 } Mtns. & causes.  
Friday, 21 } Petitions & causes.  
Saturday, 22 } Sht. causes & caus.  
Monday, 24 }  
Tuesday, 25 } Causes.  
Wednesday, 26 }  
Thursday, 27 }  
Friday, 28 } Petns. and causes.  
Saturday, 29 } Sht. causes & caus.  
Monday, 31 } Motions.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

No cause, motion for decree, or further consideration, except by order of the Court, may be marked to stand over, if it shall be within twelve of the last cause or matter in the printed paper of the day for hearing.

##### V. C. SIR RICHARD MALINS.

###### Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Jan. 11 } Mtns. & gen. pa.

Wednesday, 12 } General paper.  
Thursday, 13 }  
Friday, 14 } Petns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday, 15 } Sht. causes, adj.  
                  sums., & gen. pa.  
Monday, 17 }  
Tuesday, 18 } General paper.  
Wednesday, 19 }  
Thursday, 20 } Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday, 21 } Petns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday, 22 } Sht. causes, adj.  
                  sums., & gen. pa.  
Monday, 24 }  
Tuesday, 25 } General paper.  
Wednesday, 26 }  
Thursday, 27 }  
Friday, 28 } Petns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday, 29 } Short causes, adj.  
                  sums., & gen. pa.  
Monday, 31 } Mtns. & gen. pa.

##### V. C. SIR W. M. JAMES.

###### Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Jan. 11 } Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Wednesday, 12 }  
Thursday, 13 } General paper.  
Friday, 14 }  
Saturday, 15 } Petns., sht. causes,  
                  adj. sums., & gen.  
                  paper.  
Monday, 17 }  
Tuesday, 18 } General paper.  
Wednesday, 19 }  
Thursday, 20 } Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday, 21 } Petns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday, 22 } adj. sums., and  
                  general paper.  
Monday, 24 }  
Tuesday, 25 } General paper.  
Wednesday, 26 }  
Thursday, 27 }  
Friday, 28 } Petns., sht. caus.,  
                  adj. sums., and  
                  general paper.  
Monday, 31 } Mtns. & gen. pa.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

### QUEEN'S BENCH.

Sittings at Nisi Prius in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir A. E. COCKBURN, Bart., Lord Chief Justice of her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench, in and after Hilary Term, 1870.

#### IN TERM.

##### Middlesex.

Wednesday, Jan. 12 } Tuesday, Jan. 25  
Tuesday, 13 } 18

There will not be any sittings during Term in London.

#### AFTER TERM.

##### Middlesex.

##### London.

Tuesday, Feb. 1 } Tuesday, Feb. 15

The Court will sit at Nisi Prius on Mondays at half-past 10 o'clock, and on all other days at 10 o'clock.

The causes in the list for each of the above sitting days in Term, if not disposed of on those days, will be tried by adjournment on the days following each of such sitting days.

### COMMON PLEAS.

Sittings at Nisi Prius in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM BOVILL, Knt., Lord Chief Justice of her Majesty's Court of Common Pleas, at Westminster, in and after Hilary Term, 1870.

#### IN TERM.

##### Middlesex.

Wednesday, Jan. 12 } Tuesday, Jan. 25  
Tuesday, 13 } 18

The Court will not sit in London during term.

#### AFTER TERM.

##### Middlesex.

##### London.

Tuesday, Feb. 1 } Tuesday, Feb. 15

The Court will sit at Nisi Prius on Mondays at half-past 10 o'clock, and on all other days at 10 o'clock.



## EXCHEQUER OF PLEAS.

Sittings at Nisi Prius in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir FitzROY KELLY, Knt., Lord Chief Baron of her Majesty's Court of Exchequer, in and after Hilary Term, 1870.

IN TERM.

Middlesex.

Wednesday ..... Jan. 12 | Tuesday ..... Jan. 25  
Tuesday ..... " 18

The Court will not sit in London during term.

AFTER TERM.

Middlesex.

London.

Tuesday ..... Feb. 1 | Tuesday ..... Feb. 15

The Court will sit in Middlesex in term by adjournment from day to day until the causes entered for the respective Middlesex sittings are disposed of.

During this term the Court will sit at Nisi Prius on Mondays at half-past 10 o'clock, and on all other days at 10 o'clock.

## PUBLIC COMPANIES.

## GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Dec. 22, 1869.

[From the Official List of the actual business transacted.]

8 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85, 11 15-16
Ditto for Account, Jan. 6, 92½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reducible, 92	Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 2 p m
New 3 per Cent., 92	Ditto, £500, Do — 2 p m
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, — 2 p m
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 76	Bank of England Stock, 4½ per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year) 230
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account,

## RAILWAY STOCK.

Shrea.	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter .....	100	75
Stock	Caledonian .....	100	77½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	106
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	37½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2 .....	100	7
Stock	Great Northern .....	100	169
Stock	Do., A Stock* .....	100	109½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	99
Stock	Great Western—Original .....	100	55½
Stock	Do., West Midland—Oxford .....	100	35
Stock	Do., do.—Newport .....	100	33
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	127
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	47
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	15½
Stock	London and North-Western .....	100	122
Stock	London and South-Western .....	100	94
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	53
Stock	Metropolitan .....	100	83½
Stock	Midland .....	100	120
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby .....	100	88
Stock	North British .....	100	35
Stock	North London .....	100	121
Stock	North Staffordshire .....	100	61½
Stock	South Devon .....	100	44
Stock	South-Eastern .....	100	77½
Stock	Taff Vale .....	100	156

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

## MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

There is not much doing in any of the markets, Consols and foreign securities are rather flat, railways showed some animation at the beginning of the week, but soon subsided. The discount demand is, as usual, at this time of year, brisk. The guaranteed Indian railway stocks continue at low quotations, considering the near approach of the January dividend. Next month, it is understood, upwards of five millions will be paid as compensation to the telegraph shareholders, and the prices of investments are expected to experience some rise in consequence.

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

## BIRTHS.

BELL—On Dec. 18, at Chelmsford, the wife of Charles Bell, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter, which survived its birth only a few hours.

FOX—On Dec. 20, Mrs. J. Elliott Fox, of Gloucester Villa, Regent's-park, of a son.

WOODHAM—On Dec. 19, at Northgate House, Winchester, the wife of T. B. Woodham, Esq., of a son.

## MARRIAGES.

FARQUHAR—FARQUHAR—On Dec. 16, at the parish church, Clapham, James Hervey Farquhar, Esq., Solicitor, Abergavenny, to Sarah Georgiana, second daughter of John Farquhar, Esq., of 17, Victoria-road, Clapham-common.

HANCOCK—RUSSELL—On Dec. 16, at the parish church, Westbury-on-Trym, Charles R. Hancock, Esq., Solicitor, to Charlotte Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late Christopher Russell, Esq., M.D., of Enniskerry, county Dublin.

PHILIP—GATHERER—On Dec. 16, at 29, North-street, Elgin, N.B., David Philip, Solicitor, Supreme Courts, Edinburgh, to Isabella Gordon, younger daughter of George Gatherer, Esq., Solicitor.

PHILLIPS—PRATT—On Nov. 16, at St. Peter's Church, Fort William, Calcutta, Arthur Phillips, Esq., M.A., Barrister-at-Law, to Emma Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Mr. T. D. Pratt, of Cambridge.

STEEL—MAITLAND—On Dec. 16, at Hendon Parish Church, Sunderland, Thomas Steel, Solicitor, to Fanny Maitland, both of Sunderland.

## DEATHS.

ADAMSON—On Dec. 15, at Jesmond House, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Anne Jane, wife of Lawrence William Adamson, Advocate.

BRADFELD—On Dec. 17, suddenly, at Richmond, John Edwin Bradfield, jun, Solicitor, in his 28th year.

FREER—On Dec. 21, at Stonygate, Knighton, Elizabeth Walker, the beloved wife of William Freer, Esq., Clerk of the Peace for the county of Leicester.

NORRIS—On Dec. 20, at 9, Buckingham-vale, Clifton, Kate, infant daughter of John F. Norris, Barrister-at-Law, aged two months.

BREAKFAST.—EPPS'S COCOA.—GRATEFUL AND COMFORTING.—The very agreeable character of this preparation has rendered it a general favourite. The "Civil Service Gazette" remarks:—"By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected cocoa, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast tables with a delicately flavoured beverage which may save us many heavy doctors' bills." Made simply with boiling water or milk. Sold only in tin-lined packets, labelled—JAMES EPPS & CO., Homoeopathic Chemists, London.—[ADVT.]

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## Winding up of Joint-Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Dec. 17, 1869.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Danraven United Collieries Company (Limited).—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Adams, Cardiff, Monday, Feb 28, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Oakerthorpe Iron and Coal Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Dec 9, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor James on Dec 18. Sharp & Ulithorne, Gray's-inn, for Currey & Holland, Gt George-st, Westminster, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, Dec. 21, 1869.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Derdale Cotton and Commercial Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Dec 11, ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Gregory & Co, Bedford-row, for Marsland & Addleshaw, Manch, solicitors for the petitioners.

Gwendraeth Valleys Lime, Coal, and Railway Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor James has, by an order dated Dec 11, ordered that the above company be wound up. Fox & Robinson, Gresham House, Old Broad-st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Northern Assam Tea Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Dec 7, appointed Samuel Barrow, 24, Gresham-st, to be official liquidator. Creditors resident in Europe are required, on or before Feb 5, and creditors out of Europe are required, on or before April 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Barrow, 24, Gresham-st. Saturday, March 5, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims of the creditors resident in Europe. Saturday, May 28, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims of the creditors resident out of Europe.

Phosphate of Lime Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Mallins has, by an order dated Dec 9, appointed Samuel Lowell Price, 15, Gresham-street, to be liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Jan 12, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Lowell Price, 15, Gresham-st. Wednesday, Jan 19, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Plymouth Patent Sugar Refining Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Dec 18, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Mallins on Jan 14. Wedlake & Letts, Mitre-st, Temple, for Edmonds & Son, Plymouth, solicitors for the petitioners.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Dagenham (Thames) Dock Company.—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Dec 11, ordered that the above company be wound up, and that Stephenson Clarke, a judgment creditor, should have the carriage of the order. Wilkins & Co, St Swinith's-lane, solicitors for the said Stephenson Clarke.

## Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Dec. 17, 1869.

Choral Fund, Freemason's Tavern, Gt Queen-st, Lincoln's-inn-fields. Dec 12.

## Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Dec. 17, 1869.

Brown, Hy, Bruce-road, Bromley, Lighterman. Jan 10. Winstone v Brown, M. R. Hoare, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.  
Dickinson, Geo, Sandridge, Hertfordshire, Farmer. Jan 11. Field v Dickinson, V.C. Mallins. Annesley, St Alban's.  
Dutton, Joseph, Cheapside, Gen. Dec 20. Hepburn v Dutton, V.C. Stuart. Maraden, Queen-st, Cheapside.  
Fisher, Wm, Little Eaton, Derby, Butler. Jan 11. Riley v Raxdall, V.C. James. Moody, Derby.

Gillespie, Andrew, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Accountant. Jan 31. Gillespie & Hotham, V.C. Stuart. Armstrong, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
Higgins, Wm, Sidcot, Somerset, Gardener. Jan 31. Sanderson & Higgins, V.C. Stuart. Woolfryes, Banwell.  
Hunt, Wm, Gray's-inn-sq, Gent. Jan 10. Hunt & Hunt, V.C. Malins.  
Hunt, Gray's-inn-sq.  
Nicholl, Geo, Piccadilly, Esq. Jan 10. Wigg & Nicholl, M.R. Paterson & Co, Lombard-st.  
Rhys, Chas (or Rees), Bath, Gent. Jan 14. Rhys & Johnson, V.C. Malins. Burne, Bath.  
Robinson, Jas Edw, Pontefract, Yorkshire, Gent. Jan 20. Shirlcliffe & Robinson, V.C. James. Sharp & Ullithorpe, Field-clt, Gray's-inn.

TUESDAY, Dec. 21, 1869.

Elmore, Thos, Berrington, Salop, Gent. Jan 17. Elmore & Jeffreys, M.R. Skilbeck & Griffiths, Bedford-row.  
Hayward, Robt, Colchester, Essex, Gent. Jan 31. Hayward & Hayward, V.C. Stuart. Elwes, Furnival's-inn.  
Hilton, Thos, Ardwick, Manchester, Merchant. Jan 20. Rippon & Hilton, V.C. James. Sale, Manch.  
Hopkinson, Agnes, Brownlee-in-Rastrick, Yorkshire, Spinster. Jan 24. Sage & Ogg, V.C. Malins. Emmet & Co., Halifax.  
La Preste, Joseph Thos, Murree, East Indies, Surgeon H.M.'s Rifle Brigade. Jan 3. McNulty & Wall, V.C. Malins. Syme, Furnival's-inn.  
Lowman, Hy, Spencer-house, Surbiton-hill, Esq. Jan 31. Lowman & Lowman, V.C. Stuart. Lott, Gt George-st, Westminster.  
Pink, John, Craven-ter, Ealing, Esq. Jan 31. Pink & Rhodes, V.C. Stuart. Rhodes & Co., Chancery-lane.  
Renshaw, Jas, Gresham-house, Merchant. Jan 7. Renshaw & Renshaw, V.C. James. Tilleard & Co, Old Jewry.  
Wakefield, Saml, Bristol, Lime Burner. Feb 1. Wakefield & Beaven, V.C. Stuart. Salmon, Bristol.  
Whittingham, Thos, Stanton, Derbyshire, Farmer. Jan 15. Whittingham & Tomlinson, V.C. Malins. Tomlinson & Son, Ashbourne.

#### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Dec. 17, 1869.

Bingham, Hy Corles, Wartaby Hall, Leicester, Gent. March 1. Clarke, Melton Mowbray.  
Brogden, Jas, Holme Island, Lancashire, Esq. Jan 20. Robinson & Preston, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
Brooke, Richd Fras, Cleckheaton, York, Gent. Dec 31. Terry & Co, Cleckheaton.  
Budd, Wm, Ichen Stoke Mill, Southampton, Miller. Jan 22. Adams, Aresford.  
Cory, Chas, Hopton, Suffolk, Solicitor. Jan 1. Diver, Great Yarmouth.  
Deakin, John, Dawley-green, Salop, Charter Master. Feb 1. Phillips, Shifnal.  
Dickinson, Joseph, Newlands, Rastrick, York, Weaver. March 1. Barber, Brighouse.  
Edwin, Edward Horton, Kenton-rd, South Hackney, Mariner. Jan 20. Lydall, Southampton-bldgs, Chancery-lane.  
Goodson, Ann, Breston, Nottingham, Spinster. Feb 1. Walton & Wadsworth, Nottingham.  
Hardisty, Robt, Gt Marlborough-st, Esq. Feb 12. Hardisty & Rhodes, Gt Marlborough-st.  
Howarth, Jas, Preston, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Jan 15. Banks & Dean, Preston.  
Kenrick, Geo Cranmer, Seend, Wilts, Esq. Feb 1. Gore, Melksham.  
Lewis, Richd, Needham Market, Suffolk, Gent. Jan 25. Hayward & Sons, Needham Market.  
Lewis, Richd, Bristol, Gent. Feb 1. Wright, Wotton-under-Edge.  
Napier, David, Upper Phillimore-gardens, Kensington, Esq. Feb 1. Kempson & Co, Abingdon-st, Westminster.  
Revell, Anne Eliza, Sheffield. Jan 29. Wake, Sheffield.  
Revell, Hy, Sheffield, Gent. Jan 29. Wake, Sheffield.  
Rough, Wm Hy, East Moulsey, Surrey, Esq. Feb 21. Rivelita, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
Sacker, Margaret Ann, Sunderland, Durham, Widow. Feb 28. Steel, Sunderland.  
Smea, Margaret, Woodberry Down, Stoke Newington, Widow. Jan 1. Janson, Finsbury-claus.  
Stoddart, Danl, Charles-st, St James's, Army Agent. April 1. Tompson & Co, Stone-bldgs, Lincoln's-inn.  
Stoker, Jane, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Spinster. Feb 1. Stanton & Atkinson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
Storror, John, Newbottle, Durham, Surgeon. Jan 11. Ranson & Son, Sunderland.  
Taylor, Ann, York, Widow. Jan 20. Phillips, York.  
Turner, Lewis, Knighton, Radnor, Gent. Jan 11. Stephens, Presteign.  
Walters, John, Arnold, Nottingham, Baker. Feb 1. Robotham, Derby.  
Watson, Joseph, Castle-4, Falcon-sq, Manufacturer. Jan 29. Fielder & Sumner, Goddman's, Doctors'-commons.  
Wigram, Hy Loftus, Grosvenor-sq, Esq. Feb 5. Rickards, Crown-et Old Broad-st.

TUESDAY, Dec. 21, 1869.

Bakewell, Fredk Collier, Haverstock-ter, Hampstead, Esq. Feb 1. Wansey & Pown, Moorgate-st.  
Barrow, John, Over Darwen, Lancashire, Joiner. Jan 18. Kendall, Darwen.  
Carpenter, Rev Chas, Lawthiton-by-Launceston, Clerk. Jan 1. Frost, Launceston.  
Field, Lucy, Whifton, Suffolk, Widow. Jan 28. Hayward & Sons, Needham-market, Suffolk.  
Hardstaff, Hy Robt, West Leake, Nottinghamshire, Farmer. March 16. Woolley, Loughborough.  
Jolliffe, Chas, Ramsgate, Kent, Esq. Feb 1. Currie & Williams, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
King, Alfred, Farramatta, New South Wales, Gent. Feb 1. Richardson & Co, Lepp.  
Leach, Chas, Malgrave-pl, Woolwich, Licensed Victualler. Jan 31. Mackeson, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
Leach, Rebecca, Woolwich, Kent, Widow. Jan 31. Mackeson, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
Lewis, Louisa, Derby, Widow. March 1. Moody, Derby.  
Poulton, Jas, Hickman's Folly, Bermondsey, Butcher. Jan 15. Drew & Wilkinson, Bermondsey-st.

Sanders, Jane, Shirley, Hants, Widow. Feb 1. Sharp, jun, South-ampton.  
Surrage, John, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. Feb 8. Weall, Bell-yard, Doctors'-commons.  
Tibbets, Thos, Gerrard-st, Islington, Gent. Feb 1. Boulton & Sons, Northampton-sq, Clerkenwell.  
Turnbull, Wm, Long-lane, Bermondsey, Licensed Victualler. Feb 1. Drew & Wilkinson, Bermondsey-st.  
Underhill, Saml, Oldbury, Worcestershire, Provision Dealer. Jan 18. Wright, Oldbury.  
Vernon, Wm, March, Hop Merchant. Feb 1. Needham, Manch.

deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Dec. 17, 1869.

Acome, Geo, Little Britain, Furrer, Nov 3. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Alford, Albert, Southampton, Tailor. Nov 22. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Allen, Fredk, Stafford, Shoe Manufacturer. Nov 12. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Arter, Geo, Upper Kennington-lane, Timber Merchant. Dec 10. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Babington, Fras, Lpool, Tailor. Nov 25. Asst. Reg Dec 14.  
Baker, Wm Lloyd, Chennel-row, Bermondsey, Sail Maker. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Ballard, Walter John, Liverpool-rd, Islington, Clerk. Dec 11. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Bell, Wm, Carlisle, Butcher. Nov 22. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Bentley, Hy, New Wimbledon, Surrey, Nurseryman. Nov 24. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Bernstein, Bernhard, Chiswell-st, Importer of Fancy Goods. Nov 23. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Beynon, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Merchant. Dec 7. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Bird, Wm, Oxford-st, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 18. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
Blackburn, Jesse, Victoria-st, King Edward-rd, Hackney, Salesman. Dec 8. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Blundell, Jas, jun, & John Mason, Runcorn, Cheshire, Ship Builders. Nov 26. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Bosley, Wm, Bath, Plasterer. Nov 29. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Brooke, Geo Ezra, Hightown, York, Joiner. Nov 17. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Brooks, John Fredk, Shoreditch, Cheesemonger. Oct 20. Asst. Reg Dec 14.  
Buck, Peter, Leeds, Comp Agent. Nov 16. Asst. Reg Dec 15.  
Bushell, David, Birm, Chain Manufacturer. Dec 16. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Carpenter, Danl, Wellington-st, New Kent-rd, Tanner. Dec 13. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Chandler, Stephen, Harleyford-rd, Vauxhall, General Dealer. Dec 2. Comp. Reg Dec 13.  
Chaniler, Chas, Cranbrook, Gent, Farmer. Nov 9. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
Clarke, Joseph, Scarborough, York, Tobacconist. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
Claus, Thos Mein, & Thos Kemp, Lpool, Corn Merchants. Dec 18. Inspectorship. Reg Dec 17.  
Cox, Jas Laxton, Coventry, Licensed Victualler. Nov 27. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Crofts, Chas, Sandiacre, Derby, Market Gardener. Nov 30. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Elliott, Edward, High-st, Hampstead, Cheesemonger. Nov 27. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
Ellis, Chas, Cornhill, Manager. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Fajla, Hy, & Robt Angus, Stoke-upon-Trent, Engineers. Nov 29. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
Fairclough, Jas, sen, Gateshead, Durham, Boot Maker. Dec 1. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Garman, John, Litcham, Norfolk, Baker. Nov 19. Asst. Reg Dec 14.  
Gilbody, Ezekiel, Manch, Licensed Victualler. Nov 29. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Haigh, Wm, & Wm Wilson, Low Moor, York, Worstead Spinners. Dec 2. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
Hall, Eliza, Rochdale, Lancashire, Grocer. Dec 6. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
Hanson, Jas Wm, Nag's Head-yd, High-st, Berough, Hop Merchant. Nov 18. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
Harding, Fredk Geo, Joseph Maddox, & Wm Bird, Fore-st, Upholsterer. Nov 1. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Harding, Wm, High-st, Clapham, Auctioneer. Dec 2. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Harland, Hy, Croydon, Surrey, Jeweller. Dec 15. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
Heur, Julius August, Hamburg, Ship Broker. Dec 4. Asst. Reg Dec 15.  
Hill, Saml, & Alfd Barker Bennet, Corton-upon-Medlock, Manch, Brewers. Nov 24. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Jones, Alfd Chas, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Hosier. Nov 18. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
Jones, Wm, Newport, Monmouth, Tinman. Nov 26. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Lang, Wm Shaxson, Newport, Monmouth, Ship Owner. Nov 18. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
Lear, Richd Blackier, Violet-hill, Abbey-pl, St John's Wood, Builder. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 13.  
Little, Christopher, Newport, Monmouth, Draper. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
Lumb, Preston, Fulham-rd, Brompton, Wine Merchant. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Marshall, Joshua, Manch, Coal Dealer. Nov 30. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
Martin, Emons, Rochester, Kent, Fancy Draper. Dec 3. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Matson, John, jun, Crewe, Cheshire, Grocer. Nov 26. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
Mills, John Dodes, & Geo Hy Aird, North Shields, Northumberland, Shoe Manufacturers. Nov 18. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
Moorey, Hy, Salford, Lancashire, Builder. Nov 19. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
Mortimer, Hy, Hither-green, Lewisham, Kent, Builder. Nov 23. Asst. Reg Dec 15.  
Page, Wm Hy, Malvern-ter, Park-lane, Tottenham, Boot Maker. Dec 11. Comp. Reg Dec 15.

- Pages, Thos Bristow, Aldgate, Hosier. Nov 19. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
 Pamplin, Frank, Freemantle, Hants, Grocer. Nov 30. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
 Patchett, Joseph, Sowerby-bridge, York, Wire Manufacturer. Nov 25. Asst. Reg Dec 15.  
 Payne, Hy, Sevenoaks, Kent, Boot Maker. Nov 30. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
 Pepps, Robt Edward, Poultry, Cutler. Nov 23. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Petrick, Geo, East Stonehouse, Devon, Tailor. Dec 9. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Player, Edward, Clevee, Somerset, Grocer. Nov 23. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
 Ravenscroft, Byfleet Strove, Godalming, Surrey, Tanner. Nov 8. Asst. Reg Dec 15.  
 Read, Edwin, Mare-st, Hackney, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 30. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Rimmer, Thos, Preston, Lancashire, Grocer. Dec 3. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Rhodes, Thos, & Joseph Dobson Good, Leeds, Woollen Cloth Merchants. Nov 23. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Roberts, John, Lpool, Iron Merchant. Nov 30. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Robinson, Francis Whitelock, Wintelow, York, Farmer. Nov 13. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Ruddle, Francis, & Francis Wm Ruddle, Hereford, Hatters. Nov 11. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Russell, Chas, & Jas Hillery, Pittfield-st, Hoxton, Cheesemongers. Nov 30. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Salbridge, Wm, Bristol, Carpenter. Dec 10. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
 Saunders, Francis, Old Kent-rd, Baker. Dec 8. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
 Sharpe, Wm, Epworth, Lincolnshire, Draper. Oct 28. Asst. Reg Dec 10.  
 Simmons, Thos, & Wm Simmons, Manch, Builders. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
 Simpson, Joseph Horatio, Sheffield, Printer. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
 Stanhope, Francis, Langham, Rutland, Farmer. Nov 8. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Taylor, Hy, Lower Tooting, Surrey, Builder. Nov 25. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
 Tear, Jas, & John Tear, Sheffield, Drapers. Nov 24. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
 Terry, Geo Seymer, Gatewood Inchmary, Eabury, Hants, Farmer. Nov 24. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
 Thomas, Jas, Three Colt-st, Limehouse, Hatter. Dec 9. Comp. Reg Dec 13.  
 Trivett, Ephraim, & Wm Williamson Astill, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturers. Nov 13. Asst. Reg Dec 15.  
 Wardley, Joshua, Lytham, Lancashire, Stationer. Dec 1. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Warne, Geo, Rutland-ter, Hornsey-rd, Grocer. Dec 1. Comp. Reg Dec 14.  
 Wase, Wm, Smallthorpe, Staffordshire, Innkeeper. Nov 25. Comp. Reg Oct 14.  
 Worroll, Geo Alex, Birm, Commission Agent. Dec 7. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Wyles, Edmund, Sandgate, Kent, Grocer. Nov 19. Asst. Reg Dec 16.  
 Yates, John, Stoke-upon-Trent, Staffordshire, Builder. Nov 13. Comp. Reg Dec 16.
- TUESDAY, Dec. 21, 1869.
- Armistage, Thos, Leeds, Picture Frame Manufacturer. Dec 6. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Bailey, Wm, Essex-rd, Islington, Grocer. Dec 7. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
 Baker, Chas Albert, & Joshua Constable, Hornsey-rd, Upper Holloway, Builders. Dec 10. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Barnard, Arthur, Railway-pl, Forest Hill, Estate Agent. Dec 6. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Barnett, Wm, Leicester, Builder. Dec 10. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Beards, Thos, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Beer Retailer. Nov 18. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Bew, Wm, Hart-st, Wood-st, Merchant. Asst. Reg Dec 21.  
 Blomfield, Jas, West Stow, Suffolk, Farmer. Nov 23. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Brandrett, Matthew, Manch, Beer Retailer. Nov 20. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Cousins, Chas, Bath-ter, Bridge-avenue, Hammersmith, Manager. Dec 11. Comp. Reg Dec 21.  
 Cox, Alf, Birm, Stay Manufacturer. Nov 25. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Croisland, Jas, Huddersfield, York, Flock Dealer. Nov 23. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
 Dancy, Stephen, & Wm Dancy, Brighton, Sussex, Builders. Dec 14. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Davies, Thos, Ebbw Vale, Monmouthshire, Grocer. Nov 17. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Degras, Jas, Rupert-st, Coventry-st, Haymarket, Trunk Maker. Dec 3. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 De Matros, Wm Nicholas, Leadenhall-st, Merchant. Oct 13. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Entwistle, Joseph, Manch, Comm Agent. Dec 4. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Fisher, Fredk Chas, Moorgate-st, Stationer. Nov 23. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Frearson, Thos, Wymeswold, Leicester, Grocer. Nov 29. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 French, Thos Veitch, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Watchmaker. Nov 27. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Gale, Christopher, Hunslet, Leeds, Joiner. Dec 16. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Gee, Thos, New Kent-rd, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Gillingham, Wm, Thornton Heath, nr Croydon, Surrey, Victualler. Dec 7. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Green, Wm, jun, Hyde, Cheshire, Grocer. Dec 17. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Greenwell, Richd, Thornley, Durham, Provision Dealer. Dec 1. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
 Gregory, Thos, Rotherham, York, Steel Roller. Nov 16. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Hammond, John, Winchester, Hants, Fishing Tackle Maker. Nov 23. Comp. Reg Dec 20.
- Harris, Simon, Cambridge, Jeweller. Dec 17. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Harvey, Chas, Weston, Cheshire, Shopkeeper. Dec 14. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Hewett, Fleming, Gorleston, Suffolk, Ship Chandler. Dec 1. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Hill, Thos Chas, Lincoln, Fishing Vessel Owner. Dec 3. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Howard, Thos, Lpool, Plumber. Nov 22. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
 Hughes, John, Llanrwst, Denbigh, Timber Merchant. Nov 12. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Iles, Joseph, Kingswood, Gloucester, Cabinet Maker. Dec 1. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Keenan, Patrick, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Grocer. Nov 24. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 King, David Woolf, Lpool, Tailor. Dec 15. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Kite, Chas, King's Cross-rd, Gasfitter. Dec 2. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Knox, Jas, South Hylton, Durham, Innkeeper. Dec 2. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Lawrence, Geo, Easry, Kent, Cordwainer. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Lee, Hy, Westbourne-grove, Bayswater, Jeweller. Nov 22. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Lee, Hy Joshua, Hoyland, Yorkshire, Joiner. Dec 9. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Lever, Robt, Southport, Lancashire, Grocer. Dec 14. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Mackley, John Alborough, Portsea, Hants, Attorney's Clerk. Nov 24. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Marshall, Wm John Fredk, Kettering, Northampton, Attorney. Nov 20. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Matt, Jonathan, Ipswich, Suffolk, Cooper. Nov 20. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Mayer, Chas, Hackney-rd, Boot Manufacturer. Dec 18. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Miles, Jas, Graham-rd, Dalston, Mercantile Clerk. Nov 20. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Morris, Wm Padden, King-sq, Goswell-rd, Publican. Dec 3. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Musson, Thos, Stone, Stafford, Shoe Manufacturer. Nov 27. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Parks, Chas, Maidstone, Kent, Baker. Dec 6. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Pasquali, Chas Joseph, & Firmin Michael Reggio, Rood-lane, General Merchants. Dec 8. Comp. Reg Dec 21.  
 Petty, Watson, Church, Lancashire, Tailor. Nov 30. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
 Pollard, Jonathan Miller Andrews, Gray's-inn-rd, Licensed Victualler. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Pook, Fras, Bury-st, Chelsea, Butler. Dec 15. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Powell, Joseph, Oldbury, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Dec 2. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Price, Thos, Ystrad, Rhondda, Glamorgan, Tailor. May 6. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Quinn, Jas Aloysius, Lpool, Egg Merchant. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Ratcliff, Hy, Hurst Mill, Clun, Salop, Miller. Dec 2. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Read, John, Market Rasen, Lincoln, Common Brewer. Nov 23. Asst. Reg Dec 21.  
 Russell, Thos, Ball's-pond-rd, Draper. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 16.  
 Searth, John, Stockton, Durham, Merchant Tailor. Nov 17. Comp. Reg Dec 11.  
 Shakielton, Joshua, Leeds, Butcher. Dec 13. Comp. Reg Dec 21.  
 Sleeman, Henry Arthur, Eastbourne-ter, Hyde-park, Esq. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Sparke, William, Saffron Walden, Essex, Grocer. Nov 15. Asst. Reg Dec 11.  
 Stevens, Wm, Caves-ter, Hammersmith, Contractor's Agent. Nov 26. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Sussans, Wm Stevenson, Heigham, Norwich, Grocer. Dec 15. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Sutcliffe, Wm, Brighouse, Yorkshire, Draper. Nov 18. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Swiddells, Chas, Hensingham, Cumberland, out of business. Dec 11. Comp. Reg Dec 20.  
 Travis, Hy, sen, Edw Travis, Joseph Travis, & Saml Travis, Little-borough, Lancashire, Woollen Manufacturers. Nov 22. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Tremlett, Robt Tuck, Alderney-rd, Mile End, Clerk. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Urquhart, Jas, Leeds, Woollen Draper. Nov 26. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Venables, Wm, Burslem, Staffordshire, Grocer. Nov 24. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Walker, Geo, Beaufort-bldgs, Wine Merchant. Oct 30. Comp. Reg Dec 15.  
 Walker, Jas, Leeds, Cloth Merchant. Nov 17. Asst. Reg Dec 20.  
 Wall, John, Hastings, Sussex, Boot Maker. Nov 19. Asst. Reg Dec 17.  
 Walsh, Jas, Manch, Tobacco Dealer. Nov 16. Asst. Reg Dec 21.  
 Warburton, Peter, Hutchbank, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. Dec 15. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Wetters, Geo Jas, Salfords, Horley, Surrey, Grocer. Dec 14. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Watts, Wm Huxon, Church-lane, Hampstead, Builder. Nov 23. Comp. Reg Dec 18.  
 Wehln, Gustav, Tavistock-sq, Bloomsbury, Watchmaker. Oct 28. Comp. Reg Dec 17.  
 Whitehead, John, & Anthony Ogden, Newton-leath, nr Manch, Brewers. Nov 26. Asst. Reg Dec 21.  
 Wightman, Richd, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. Nov 30. Asst. Reg Dec 18.  
 Wright, Alfred, Little Alle-st, Whitechapel, Iron Forge Manufacturer. Nov 19. Comp. Reg Dec 17.

**Bankrupts.**

FRIDAY, Dec. 17, 1869.  
 To Surrender in London.

Avery, Wm, Richmond-rd, Dalston, Tailor. Pet Dec 1. Pepps, Jan 7 at 11. New, Basinghall-st.



Bailey, Charlotte, Queen-st, Hammermith, out of business. Pet Dec 15. Pepps. Dec 30 at 2. Webb, Austin-friers, Old Broad-st.  
 Bartow, Wm, Nubourn-st, Notting-hill, Cattle Dealer. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 12. Smith, Bedford-row.  
 Barnard, Jas, Kingsland-rd, Confectioner. Pet Dec 15. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Carter & Bell, Leadenhall-st.  
 Barr, Richd Roberts, Mara-ter, Plumstead, Baker. Pet Dec 15. Jan 5 at 1. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.  
 Barry, John, Avenue-rd, Hammersmith, Warehouse Clerk. Pet Dec 15. Murray. Dec 30 at 2. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.  
 Baxter, Wm Christoper, Walthamstow, Essex, Builder. Pet Dec 15. Jan 5 at 12. Woodward, Ingram-st, Fenchurch-st.  
 Beckwith, Joseph Bartholomew, Bernondsey-st, Southwark, Carpenter. Pet Dec 15. Murray. Dec 27 at 2. Eaden, Gray's-inn-sq.  
 Bentley, Wm Wellington, Spencer-st, Dulwich, Financial Agent. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Bailey, Tokenhouse-yard.  
 Bewan, Alex, Upper North-st, Poplar, Baker. Pet Dec 13. Jan 4 at 1. Lumley & Lumley, Old Jewry-chambers.  
 Blackstock, Joseph, Brecknock-rd, Camden-rd, Wine Dealer. Pet Dec 10. Pepps. Dec 31 at 1. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.  
 Bowen, John Jas, Euston-rd, Penteter. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Shiers, New-inn, Strand.  
 Bristow, Edwd Robt, Twickenham, Middlesex, Carpenter. Pet Dec 10. Jan 4 at 11. Drake, Basinghall-st.  
 Buckland, Jeremiah, Ealing, Builder. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.  
 Chesterfield, Jas, Godmanchester, Huntingdonshire, Cement Factor. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 2. Neal & Philpot, Gt Knight-rider-st, Doctors'-commons.  
 Childs, Chas, Gt Dover-st, Southwark, out of business. Pet Dec 11. Jan 4 at 12. Barton & Drew, Fore-st, Hatton-garden.  
 Churchill, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 5 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Clark, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 11 (for pau). Pepps. Jan 6 at 11. Collett, Bloomsbury-sq.  
 Coleman, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 10. Brougham. Jan 4 at 11. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Crose, Robt Fredk, Park-ter, Penge-rd, Solicitor. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 6 at 1. Kerby, London-wall.  
 Davis, Jas, Cambridge, Watchmaker. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 11. Nind, Basinghall-st.  
 Deak, Alfred, Cross-st, Upper-st, Islington, Dairyman. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Langton, Walbrook.  
 Everest, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 10 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 11. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Fairhall, Edwin, Jan, Watcombe, Sussex, Farmer. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Bartram, St Paul's-rd, Canonbury.  
 Farnilo, David, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 11 (for pau). Murray. Dec 30 at 11. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Fernie, Robertson, Southampton-row, Bloomsbury, Clerk. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 12. Gray, Fenchurch-st.  
 Fuller, Jas, Andover-rd, Islington, Builder. Pet Dec 11. Pepps. Dec 31 at 12. Childoy, Old Jewry.  
 Gantlett, Thos, Clarendon-st, Piccolo, Tobacconist. Pet Dec 9. Dec 31 at 1. Spicer, Staple-inn.  
 Gardener, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, Bury St. Edmunds. Pet Dec 11. Jan 4 at 12. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.  
 Gainer, Wm, Ann's-rd, Notting-hill, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 6 at 1. Wilkinson, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Goldsmith, Wm Jas Chas, Chapel End, Walthamstow, Essex, Carpenter. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 6 at 1. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.  
 Gregory, Chas, Sussex-st, Brixton-hill, Boot Maker. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 1. Barron, Queen-st.  
 Harding, Jas Wm, Stratford, Essex, Baker. Pet Dec 13. Jan 4 at 1. Lumley & Lumley, Old Jewry-chambers.  
 Harley, Thos Clifford, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 10 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 1. Rigby, Gresham-st.  
 Harris, Abraham, St George's-st East, Manager to a Clothier. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 12. Harrison, Basinghall-st.  
 Harris, Saml, Edenhams-st, Kensal New Town, out of business. Pet Dec 15. Pepps. Jan 7 at 12. Harrison, Basinghall-st.  
 Higgs, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 13 (for pau). Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Goatley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.  
 Hill, Wm Horatio, Norwich, Grocer. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 11. Story, King's-rd, Bedford-row; Sadd, Norwich.  
 Hillier, John, Bassett-st, Kentish-town, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 7 at 12. Newman, Buckersbury.  
 Hocking, Ben Matthews, Hendon, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 10. Pepps. Dec 31 at 12. Marsh, Billiter-st.  
 Hope, Chas Fredk, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 10 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Hough, John Paul, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Murray. Dec 27 at 2. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Howe, Thos Heslop, Seaford, Sussex, no business. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 11. Patterson & Co, Lombard st.  
 Hubbard, Hy Cobb, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Murray. Dec 27 at 2. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Hunning, Edwd, Jan, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 11 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 12. Hicks, Frances-ter, Hackney-wick.  
 Jones, Fredk Hennessy Sandeman, Bridge-rd, Hammersmith, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 11. Seaman, Russell-sq.  
 Keene, Fredk Benj Brooke, Wycombe-ter, Hornsey-rd, Holloway, Furniture Dealer. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 11. Treherne & Co, Aldermanbury.  
 Kemp, Chas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 11 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 1. Goatley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.  
 Lacey, Jas Timmis, Sandown, Isle of Wight, Builder. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Loxley & Morley, Chesapeake.  
 Ladeford, Jas John, Handsworth, Staffordshire, Architect. Pet Dec 3 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 130.  
 Lindup, John, Worthing, Sussex, Bootmaker. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 7 at 11. Linklaters & Co, Walbrook.  
 Lock, Edwd, New Malden, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 15. Murray. Dec 27 at 12. Drake, Basinghall-st.  
 Marvin, Eliz, Regent-st, Milliner. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 2. Aleock, Queen-st, Brompton.

Merritt, Thos Edwd, Meopham, Kent, Artist. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Nickinson & Co, Chancery-lane.  
 Middleton, Louis Fras, Essex-st, Strand, News Agent. Pet Dec 9. Pepps. Dec 31 at 11. Bilton, Coleman-st.  
 Mitchell, Fras Thos, South-st, New North-rd, Islington, India Rubber Surgical Instrument Maker. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 11. Murray, Gt St Helen's.  
 Morgan, Jas Edwd, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 8 (for pau). Brougham. Dec 31 at 1. Lilley, Trinity-st, Newington.  
 Neale, Jas, Basing-pl, Kingsland-rd, no occupation. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 2. Butcher, Bouverie-st, Fleet-st.  
 Newell, Freeman, Hermitage-villas, Richmond, Comm Traveller. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 27 at 11. Roscoe & Hincks, King-st, Finsbury-sq, for Deacon, Peterborough.  
 Owen, Saml Claydon, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Murray. Dec 27 at 2. Davis, Harp-lane.  
 Pankhurst, Benj Baker, Charlotte-st, Albert-rd, North Woolwich. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 11. Rigby, Gresham-st.  
 Parsons, Geo Hy, & Tm Saunders, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Builders. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 11. Vizard & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields, for Beckingsale, Newport.  
 Petty, Fras, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 13 (for pau). Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Weatherhead, Coleman-st.  
 Phillips, John, Norwich, Licensed Common Brewer. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 7 at 11. Storey, King's-rd, Bedford-row, for Sadd, Norwich.  
 Pickett, John Thos, Hanover-pl, Essex-st, Islington, Dairyman. Pet Dec 14. Murray. Dec 30 at 1. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.  
 Poole, Jas Guy, Threadneedle-st, Merchant. Pet Nov 23. Murray. Dec 30 at 11. Fox & Robinson, Gresham-house, Old Broad-st.  
 Powell, Oswald Jas, Cleveland-st, Camberwell, Paper Hanger. Pet Dec 13. Jan 5 at 1. Hicklin & Co, Trinity-sq, Borough.  
 Ravener, Richd, Dartford, Kent, out of business. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Harcourt & Macarthur, Moorgate-st.  
 Reeve, John, Jan, St Paul's-rd, Camden-town, Clerk. Pet Dec 13. Jan 4 at 1. Richardson, George-st, Mansion House.  
 Rosier, Walter Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 13 (for pau). Brougham. Jan 4 at 130. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Russell, Walter Herbert, Featherstone-bldgs, High Holborn, Relief Stamp. Pet Dec 13. Jan 4 at 130. Nind, Basinghall-st.  
 Sendall, Hy, & Chas Sendall, Nutfield, Surrey, Butchers. Pet Dec 10. Jan 10 at 11. Duncan & Merton, Southampton-st, Bloomsbury; Hart & Head, Reigate.  
 Sharpe, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 13 (for pau). Pepps. Jan 6 at 12. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Shillito, Hy Thompson, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 9. Dec 31 at 1. Chapman & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Silvester, Richd, Drury-lane, Coach Ironmonger. Pet Dec 15. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Hall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Smith, John, John-st, St John's Wood, out of business. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Haynes, Duke-st, Manchester-sq.  
 Triggs, Wm, Mansell-st, Whitechapel, Plumber. Pet Dec 13. Murray. Dec 30 at 12. Godfrey, Hatton garden.  
 Turner, Geo, Winkter-st, Manchester-rd, Poplar, out of business. Pet Dec 15. Jan 5 at 1. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st.  
 Wade, John Chas, Doby-ct, Maiden-lane, Queen-st, Upper Thames-st, Waste Paper Dealer. Pet Dec 11. Pepps. Dec 31 at 11. Aldridge, Mark-lane.  
 Watts, Richd, Mansfield-pl, Kentish-town, Carrier. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 11. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Wilkins, Geo, Kennerly, Surrey, Butcher. Pet Dec 14. Jan 5 at 11. Hicklin & Co, Trinity-sq, Southwark.  
 Wilson, Edmund Bailey, Egham, Surrey, Innkeeper. Pet Dec 10. Dec 31 at 130. Miller & Miller, Sherborne-lane; Spiller, Egham.  
 Winkworth, Jas, Briamond-rd, Surbiton-hill, Carpenter. Pet Dec 14. Pepps. Jan 7 at 12. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs.  
 Wise, Chas Eyre, Southwick, Sussex, Master Mariner. Pet Dec 1. Pepps. Jan 7 at 11. Pullen, King-sr, Chesapeake.  
 Wormsley, John Rootham, Earith, St Ives, Huntingdon, Carpenter. Pet Dec 13. Jan 4 at 130. Jacobs, Bedford-row.  
 Wright, Jas Smith, Clifton, Bedfordshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 15. Jan 5 at 1. Hare, Mitre-ct, Temple.

## To Surrender in the Country.

Abbey, Herbert, Sheffield, out of business. Pet Dec 13. Wake. Sheffield, Dec 29 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.  
 Abraham, Hy, Stony Stratford, Buckinghamshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 13. Bull. Newport Pagnell, Dec 29 at 4. Conquest & Stimson, Bedford.  
 Astill, Walter, Louth, Lincolnshire, Confectioner. Pet Dec 13. Uppelby. Lincoln, Dec 29 at 11. Rex, Lincoln.  
 Attridge, Stephen Gorton, Chesham, Essex, Assistant to a Poultry Dealer. Pet Dec 2 (for pau). Wade. Dunmow, Dec 23 at 10. Johnson, Gt Dunmow.  
 Baker, Wm, Longpark, Saint Mary Church, Devon, Farmer. Pet Dec 14. Exeter, Dec 28 at 2. Hooper & Woollen, Torquay; Fland, Exeter.  
 Barker, David, South Dunstable, Bedfordshire, Sawyer. Pet Dec 14. Austin. Luton, Dec 31 at 4. Bailey, Luton.  
 Barron, Jonathan, Devonport, out of employment. Pet Dec 14. Pearce. East Stonehouse, Dec 29 at 11. Edmonds & Son, Plymouth.  
 Bellairs, Sarah Ann, & Jane Alice Benarose, Spalding, Lincolnshire, Dealers in Boots. Pet Dec 10. Bonner. Spalding, Dec 23 at 10. Percival, Spalding.  
 Bestwick, Wm, Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Hubbersty. Burton-on-Trent, Dec 29 at 10. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent.  
 Blore, Wm, Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, Taxidermist. Pet Dec 11. Flint. Uttoxeter, Dec 29 at 11. Cowlishaw, Uttoxeter.  
 Bogle, Mary, & Hy Bogle, Birm, Grocers. Pet Dec 13. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Rowlands, Birm.  
 Booth, Thos, Batley, Yorkshire, Joiner. Pet Dec 15. Leeds, Dec 27 at 11. Ibberson, Dewsbury; Bond & Barwick, Leeds.  
 Bostock, Hy, Babbington, Nottingham, Collier. Pet Dec 4. Ingle. Belper, Dec 30 at 11. Smith, Derby.  
 Boustead, Geo, Carlisle, Draper. Pet Dec 13. Halton. Carlisle, Dec 30 at 11. Wright, Carlisle.

- Bowery, Jesse, Gloucester, Grocer. Pet Dec 14. Wilde. Bristol, Dec 28 at 11. Cooke, Gloucester.
- Broadbridge, Geo, Lpool, General Broker. Pet Oct 21. Lpool, Dec 29 at 11. Etty, Lpool.
- Bramby, Joshua, Lpool, Foreman. Pet Dec 14. Hime. Lpool, Dec 28 at 12.30. Nordon, Lpool.
- Burnett, Saml, Louth, Lincolnshire, Picture Frame Maker. Pet Dec 11. Waite. Louth, Dec 29 at 10. Hyde, Louth.
- Buscall, Wm Chas, Sheffield, Cabinet Maker. Pet Dec 15. Wake. Sheffield, Dec 29 at 1. Sugg, Sheffield.
- Carter, Chas Hy, Pudsey, Yorkshire, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Bradford, Jan 11 at 9.15. Terry & Robinson, Bradford.
- Challice, Thos, Plymouth, Devon, Baker. Pet Dec 14. Pearce. East Stonehouse, Dec 29 at 11. Edmonds & Son, Plymouth.
- Chapman, Leonard, Hulme, Manch, Butter Merchant. Pet Dec 15. Hulton, Salford, Dec 29 at 9.30. Hampson, Manch.
- Clay, Jas, Langford Badville, Somersetshire, no business. Pet Dec 11. Burridge. Wellington, Dec 29 at 12. Taunton, Taunton.
- Clews, Chas Hodgetts, Cradley, Worcester, Woollen Mop Manufacturer. Pet Dec 15. Harward. Stourbridge, Dec 31 at 10. Freer & Perry Stourbridge.
- Collingwood, Saml, Birm, out of business. Pet Dec 11. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Parry, Birm.
- Cooper, Ellen Hilton, Chipping Wycombe, Bucks, Milliner. Pet Dec 14. Parker. High Wycombe, Dec 29 at 11. Spicer, Gt Marlow.
- Cordingley, Chas Augustus, Lytham, Lancashire, out of business. Pet Dec 13. Dec 30 at 11. Lupton, Lpool.
- Crosley, Richd, Sheffield, Plumber. Pet Dec 16. Wake. Sheffield, Dec 29 at 1. Mellor, Sheffield.
- Culverwell, Wm, Bishops Lydeard, Somersetshire, Baker. Pet Dec 13. Meyler. Taunton, Dec 29 at 12. Trenchard, Taunton.
- Cutler, Maria, Wollaston, Worcesterhire, Provision Dealer. Pet Dec 13. Harward. Stourbridge, Dec 31 at 10. Wall, Stourbridge.
- Durrans, Matthias, Raistrick, Yorkshire, Woollen Slubber. Pet Dec 13. Rankin. Halifax, Dec 31 at 10. Holroyde & Smith, Halifax.
- Elston, John, Birm, Butcher. Pet Dec 15. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Hawkes, Birm.
- Emeny, John Andrew, Keswick, Cumberland, Butcher. Pet Dec 14. Broatch. Keswick, Dec 23 at 11. Ansell, Keswick.
- Evans, John, Whiteheath-gate, Worcesterhire, Retail Brewer. Pet Dec 15. Watson. Oldbury, Jan 5 at 10. Shakespeare, Oldbury.
- Faulconbridge, Wm, sen, Nottingham, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Tudor. Birm, Dec 28 at 11. Beik, Nottingham.
- Foster, John, Misterton, Nottinghamshire, Bootmaker. Pet Dec 11. Burton. Gainsborough, Dec 28 at 11. Haynes, Gainsborough.
- Garrett, Benj, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Adj Dec 10. Wilde. Bristol, Dec 28 at 11.
- Goldman, Marks, South Shields, Durham, Dealer in Tobacco. Pet Dec 15. Wawn. South Shields, Dec 30 at 12. Duncan, South Shields.
- Gray, Joseph, Lpool, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 16. Lpool, Dec 28 at 12. Kenion, Lpool.
- Griffiths, Griffith, Maerdy, Denbigh, Shoemaker. Pet Dec 6. James. Corwen, Dec 22 at 11. Hughes, Corwen.
- Hall, Chas, Nottingham, Journeyman Shoemaker. Pet Dec 14. Patchitt. Nottingham, Feb 9 at 10.30. Heathcote, Nottingham.
- Hancock, Danl, Kildgrove, Staffordshire, Miner. Pet Dec 14. Challinor. Hanley, Jan 8 at 11. Leech, Newcastle-under-Lyme.
- Hanzell, Thos Smith, Lpool, Shipwright. Pet Dec 15. Lpool, Dec 29 at 12. Gregory, Lpool.
- Hartland, John, Wm Hy Hartland, Sheffield, Stone Merchants. Pet Dec 13. Wake. Sheffield, Dec 29 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.
- Hayward, Isaac, Stoke's-rd, Hants, Bootmaker. Pet Dec 13. Howard. Portsmouth, Jan 21 at 12. Blake, Portsea.
- Heap, Jonathan, Northwich, Cheshire, Wine Merchant. Pet Dec 13. Lpool, Dec 28 at 12. Boote & Rylance, Manch.
- Heatley, Wm, Everton, nr Lpool, Comm Agent. Pet Dec 9. Hime. Lpool, Dec 28 at 2. Grocott, Lpool.
- Helliwell, Alfred, Raistrick, Yorkshire, Tea Dealer. Pet Dec 16. Leeds, Dec 27 at 11. Barber, Brighouse; Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
- Hill, Benj, Garston, Lancashire, Joiner. Pet Dec 14. Lpool, Dec 28 at 11. Willocks, Lpool.
- Hoare, John, Gt Cranford, Dorsetshire, Road Contractor. Pet Dec 11. Rawlins. Wimborne Minster, Dec 31 at 4. Atkinson, Blandford.
- Ince, John, Bromsgrove, Worcesterhire. Pet Dec 14. Scott. Bromsgrove, Dec 29 at 10. Simmons, Redditch.
- Johnston, Wm Galt, Lpool, Ship Smith. Pet Dec 16. Lpool, Dec 29 at 11. Miller & Co, Lpool.
- Jones, David, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Kay. Manch, Jan 13 at 9.30. Ambler, Manch.
- Jones, John, Lpool, Boot Maker. Pet Dec 11. Hime. Lpool, Dec 28 at 11. Worship, Lpool.
- Kaye, Thos, Wakefield, Yorkshire, out of business. Pet Dec 15. Leeds, Dec 27 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.
- Knowles, Joseph, Dudley-hill, Yorkshire, Bootmaker. Pet Dec 14. Bradford, Jan 7 at 9.15. Rhodes, Bradford.
- Leighton, Chas, Fenton, Staffordshire, out of business. Pet Dec 13. Hill. Birm, Dec 29 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
- Lister, Joseph, & John Marriott, Bailey Carr, Yorkshire, out of business. Pet Dec 16. Leeds, Dec 27 at 11. Harle, Leeds.
- Marks, Wm Geo, Gt Marlow, Bucks, Beer-shop Keeper. Pet Dec 14. Parker. High Wycombe, Dec 29 at 11. Spicer, Gt Marlow.
- Marshall, Thos, Kingston-upon-Hull, Hosier. Pet Dec 15 (for pau). Phillips. Kingston-upon-Hull, Dec 28 at 11. Spurr & Chambers, Hull.
- Mathews, Robt, Netley, Hants, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 11. Thorndike. Southampton, Dec 28 at 12. Guy, Southampton.
- May, Edwd, Jun, Brighton, Sussex, Grocer. Pet Dec 13. Evershed. Brighton, Dec 31 at 11. Runcacies, Brighton.
- McCaskrie, Edwd, Gloucester, Commercial Traveller. Pet Dec 11. Wilton. Gloucester, Jan 1 at 12. Taynton, Gloucester.
- McDonald, Jas Alex, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Kay. Manch, Jan 13 at 9.30. Ambler, Manch.
- Moon, Richd, & Edwd Deathe, Toxteth-pk, Lpool, Provision Dealers. Pet Dec 19. Lpool, Dec 30 at 11. Evans & Lockett, Lpool.
- Moon, Wm, Harding, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Clerk. Pet Dec 15. Lpool, Dec 29 at 11. Bellringer, Lpool.
- Mortimer, Mary Ann, Leaven-heath, Suffolk, Spinster. Pet Dec 14. Newman. Hadleigh, Dec 30 at 10. Pearce, Ipswich.
- Murray, Geo Fredk, Southampton, Publican. Pet Dec 13. Thorndike. Southampton, Dec 28 at 12. Lobb, Southampton.
- Nadin, Saml, Blackfordby, Leicestershire, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Dewes. Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Dec 31 at 12. Wilson, Burton-upon-Trent.
- Newall, Saml, Voryd, Flint, Shipwright. Pet Dec 11. Sisson. St Asaph, Dec 29 at 11. Davies, Holywell.
- Nind, Philip Pitt, Torquay, Devon, Surgeon. Pet Dec 13. Exeter, Dec 28 at 1. Campion, Exeter.
- Owen, Robt, Birm, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Hill. Birm, Dec 29 at 12. East, Birm.
- Parkes, Alex, Gravelly-hill, Warwickshire, Manager of Tube Works. Pet Dec 13. Hill. Birm, Dec 29 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
- Pinder, John, Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire, Hairdresser. Pet Dec 13. Newton. Newark, Dec 29 at 12. Ashley, Newark.
- People, Abraham, Burnham, Somersetshire, Stone Contractor. Pet Dec 15. Davies. Weston-super-Mare, Dec 28 at 11.40. Baker & Phillott, Weston-super-Mare.
- Proctor, Wm Hy, Westbromwich, Staffordshire, Linendrapers Assistant. Pet Dec 15. Watson. Oldbury, Jan 5 at 10. Parry, Birm.
- Ridgers, Wm Hy, Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire, Cabinet Maker. Pet Dec 11. Newton. Newark, Dec 29 at 12. Belk, Nottingham.
- Riley, John, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Kay. Manch, Jan 13 at 9.30. Ambler, Manch.
- Ringham, Mark, Kingston-on-Hull, Watchmaker. Pet Dec 8. Phillips. Kingston-on-Hull, Dec 30 at 11.
- Robbins, Jas, Newport, Monmouthshire, Grocer. Pet Dec 14. Roberts. Newport, Dec 29 at 12. Pain, Newport.
- Roberts, Wm, Wrexham, Denbighshire, Cattle Jobbers Assistant. Pet Dec 15. Reid. Wrexham, Dec 31 at 11. Sherratt, Wrexham.
- Roberts, Wm, Burslem, Staffordshire, Journeyman Potter. Pet Dec 13. Challinor. Hanley, Jan 8 at 11. Tomkinson, Burslem.
- Roberts, Evan, Ynyssais, Cardigan, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 14. Wilde. Bristol, Dec 30 at 11. Williams, Llanidloes; Press & Inskip, Bristol.
- Robinson, Fredk, Hastings, Sussex, Shoemaker. Pet Dec 13. Young. Hastings, Dec 29 at 11. Philbrick, Hastings.
- Saville, Richd, Newton, Manch, Joiner. Pet Dec 15. Kay. Manch, Jan 13 at 9.30. Pinnett, Manch.
- Sheridan, Chas, Birm, out of business. Pet Dec 1. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Allen, Birm.
- Shirt, Saml, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Factory Operative. Pet Dec 15. Hall. Ashton-under-Lyne, Dec 30 at 12. Koscoe, Ashton-under-Lyne.
- Simpson, Christopher, Hanley, Staffordshire, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Challinor. Hanley, Jan 8 at 11. Welch, Hanley.
- Smith, Wm, Bradford, Yorkshire, Grocer. Pet Dec 14. Bradford, Jan 7 at 9.15. Hutchinson, Bradford.
- Smith, John, Church Aston, Salop, Merchants Clerk. Pet Dec 11. Liddle. Newport, Jan 8 at 10. Walker, Wellington.
- Soans, Richd, Prisoner for Debt, Kingston-upon-Hull. Adj Dec 8. Phillips. Kingston-upon-Hull, Dec 30 at 12.
- Stenton, Fredk, Sheffield, Bricklayer. Pet Dec 11. Wake. Sheffield, Dec 29 at 1. Clegg, Sheffield.
- Stockwell, Jas, Arncliffe, Yorkshire, Fishmonger. Pet Dec 16. Marshall. Leeds, Dec 29 at 12. Shackleton & Son, Leeds.
- Stoddart, Thos, Bolam, Durham, Labourer. Pet Dec 13. Trotter. Bishop Auckland, Dec 30 at 10. Thornton, Bishop Auckland.
- Stones, Hy, New Acerrington, Lancashire, Rope Maker. Pet Dec 10. Woodcock. Haslingden, Dec 31 at 10. Bannister, Acerrington.
- Teasdale, Geo, Salford, Lancashire, Engine Driver. Pet Dec 14. Kay. Manch, Jan 13 at 9.30. Burton, Manch.
- Thomas, Wm Howell, Birm, Journeyman Carpenter. Pet Dec 15. Gneer. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Fallows, Birm.
- Thompson, John, Grange-town, nr Cardiff, Glamorganshire, Rope-maker. Pet Dec 15. Wilde. Bristol, Dec 30 at 11. Press & Inskip, Bristol.
- Thresh, Hy, Barnsley, Yorkshire, Tailor. Pet Dec 13. Bury. Barnsley, Dec 31 at 3. Frudd, Barnsley.
- Timmins, Joseph, Penryn, Cornwall, Grocer. Pet Dec 13. Tilly. Falmouth, Dec 28 at 11. Tremewen, Falmouth.
- Tucker, Fredk Walter, Norwich, Comm Agent. Pet Dec 15. Palmer. Norwich, Dec 28 at 11. Ladd, Norwich.
- Turner, Theodore, Exeter, Cabinet Maker. Pet Dec 16. Daw. Exeter, Dec 28 at 11. Campion, Exeter.
- Uttley, Abraham, Blackburn, Lancashire, out of business. Pet Dec 11. Bolton. Blackburn, Jan 3 at 1. Pickup, Blackburn.
- Vickery, Richd Waterman, Tiverton, Devon, Furniture Dealer. Pet Dec 14. Daw. Tiverton, Dec 29 at 11. Clarke & Payne, Tiverton.
- Wads, Robt, Knarsborough, Yorkshire, Brewer. Pet Dec 15. Leeds, Dec 27 at 11. Hirst & Capes, Knarsborough; Simpson, Leeds.
- Waling, Alfred Edwd, Long Sutton, Lincolnshire, Machinist. Pet Dec 13. Caparn. Holbeach, Dec 28 at 11. Ollard, Holbeach.
- Walkington, Wm, Manch, out of business. Pet Dec 11. Kay. Manch, Jan 12 at 9.30. Marriott, Manch.
- Walters, Geo, Pinhoe, Devon, Corn Dealer. Pet Dec 13. Exeter, Dec 28 at 12. Rogers, Exeter.
- Warburton, John, Lpool, Journeyman House Paint r. Pet Dec 13. Hime. Lpool, Dec 28 at 11.30. Morgan, Lpool.
- Watts, Luke, Melcombe Regis, Dorsetshire, Painter. Pet Dec 15. Andrews. Weymouth, Jan 3 at 11. Tizard & George, Weymouth.
- West, Thos, Hemel Hempstead, Hertford, Grocer. Pet Dec 7. Blagg. St Albans, Dec 29 at 2. Shiers, New-inn.
- Wood, Joseph, Nottingham, Hairdresser. Pet Dec 6. Tudor. Birm, Dec 28 at 11. Cowley, Nottingham.

TUESDAY, Dec. 31, 1869.

To Surrender in London.

- Abbott, Jas, High-st, Wandsworth, Brush Dealer. Pet Dec 16. Pepps. Jan 7 at 1. Lewis & Co, Basinghall-st.
- Allen, Alfred Benj de Lisle, Kilburn-pk-rd, Maidland-vale, Surgeon. Pet Dec 18. Murray. Jan 3 at 11. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Guildhall.
- Allen, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau). Pepps. Jan 7 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.
- Barber, Robt, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau). Murray. Jan 3 at 12. Hicks, Francis-st, Hackney-wick.
- Barwell, Geo John, Bromley-by-Bow, Grocer. Pet Dec 17. Murray. Jan 3 at 1. Edwards, Bush-lane, Cannon-st.

Bonfield, Wm Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau).  
 Pepps. Dec 31 at 2. Kimberley, Scott's-yl, Bush-lane.  
 Brace, Geo Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 17 (for pau).  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 1. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Braid, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau). Brough-  
 ham. Jan 10 at 11. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Bridgen, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 14 (for pau). Brough-  
 ham. Jan 5 at 12. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Bristow, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 18 (for pau). Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 2. Nash, Bevois-st, Basinghall-st.  
 Brown, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 18 (for pau). Brough-  
 ham. Jan 10 at 1. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Bryant, Ebenezer Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau).  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 11. Hicks, Francis-ter, Hackney-wick.  
 Bryett, Lewis, Gosport, Hants, Auctioneer. Pet Dec 17. Murray. Jan  
 3 at 1. Burt, Guildhall-chambers.  
 Buckle, Fms, Westbourne-grove, Bayswater, Upholsterer. Pet Dec 18.  
 Jan 12 at 12. Fritchard & Co, Bell-yl, Doctors'-common.  
 Chaplin, Chas, Norwich, out of business. Pet Dec 18. Pepps. Jan 7  
 at 2. Westall & Co, Leadenhall-st.  
 Child, Wm Hy, St Andrew's-st, Westworth-rd, Builder. Pet Dec 17.  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 1. Snell, George-st, Mansion-house.  
 Childs, Richd, Chenies-st, Tottenham-ct-rd, Lithographic Artist. Pet  
 Dec 17. Murray. Jan 3 at 1. Lindus, Cheapside.  
 Corby, Chas, Hillingdon, Middx, Builder. Pet Dec 17. Pepps. Jan 7  
 at 1. Gardiner, St Swithin's-lane.  
 Cornwell, Levi, Stratford, Essex, no business. Pet Dec 17. Jan 10 at  
 12. Vann, Worship-st, Finsbury.  
 Coringham, Richd, Canterbury, Kent, Watchmaker. Pet Dec 15.  
 Pepps. Jan 7 at 11. Rigby, Gresham-st.  
 Crow, Edwd, Richmond-ter, Shepherd's-bush, Tailor. Pet Dec 17.  
 Jan 10 at 12. Davis, Chancery-lane.  
 Currie, Mark Riddell, Haseldene, Sussex, Merchant. Pet Dec 13. Pepps.  
 Jan 6 at 12. Masterman, Pancras-lane.  
 Davies, Wm Clifford, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau).  
 Pepps. Dec 31 at 2. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Davis, Chas, Windmill-ct, Smithfield, out of business. Pet Dec 13.  
 Pepps. Jan 6 at 11. Davis, Harp-lane, St Tower-st.  
 Davis, John, Kingsthorpe, Northampton, out of business. Pet Dec 14.  
 Pepps. Jan 7 at 11. Hicks, Francis-ter, Hackney Wick.  
 De Lavigerie, Louis Antoine Justin Alfi Duboys, St Swithin's-lane,  
 Theatrical Manager. Pet Dec 13. Pepps. Jan 6 at 12. Watson,  
 Basinghall-st.  
 Deplanche, Martin Theodore de la Trinite, Prisoner for Debt, London.  
 Pet Dec 17. Jan 10 at 1. Abrahams, Old Jewry.  
 Dunstan, Peter, Manasseh, Chippenharn-ter, Harrow-rd, Grocer. Pet  
 Dec 18. Jan 10 at 12. Tiley, Finsbury-pl South.  
 Edmunds, John Drunkley, Stratford, Essex, Grocer. Pet Dec 13. Jan  
 4 at 12. Peverley, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st.  
 Eldridge, Arthur Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 17 (for pau).  
 Pepps. Jan 7 at 2. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Ferguson, Robt Gordon, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 17 (for  
 pau). Pepps. Jan 13 at 11. Bannister & Co, Rectory House, Mar-  
 tin's lane.  
 Fischart, Chas Wm Fredo Fischer, Stalham-st, Paddington, out of  
 business. Pet Dec 18. Pepps. Jan 6 at 12. Marshall, Lincoln's-  
 inn-fields.  
 Ford, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 17 (for pau). Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 2. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Francis, Jas, St Martin's-st, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 13. Jan 4  
 at 1. Bishop, Essex-st, Strand.  
 Franklin, John, York-pl, Portman-sq, Milliner. Pet Dec 18. Murray.  
 Jan 5 at 11. Ryan, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 French, Thos, Sandtoft-villas, Palace-rd, Upper Norwood, Lodging-  
 house Keeper. Pet Dec 15. Pepps. Jan 7 at 1. Kent & Co, Can-  
 non-st.  
 Gaunt, Jas, Godmanchester, Huntingdonshire, Pig Dealer. Pet Dec 17.  
 Pepps. Jan 6 at 2. Fox & Co, Gresham-house, Old Broad-st.  
 Goebly, Chas, Queen's-crescent, Haverstock-hill, China Dealer. Pet  
 Dec 18. Pepps. Jan 7 at 1. Denton & Co, Gray's-inn-sq.  
 Grainger, Saml, Canterbury, Kent, Steam Saw Mill Proprietor. Pet Dec  
 17. Pepps. Jan 6 at 2. Sturt, Ironmonger-lane, for Sankey & Co,  
 Canterbury.  
 Griffiths, Thos, Durham-rd, Plumstead, Carpenter. Pet Dec 17. Mur-  
 ray. Jan 3 at 1. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.  
 Harrington, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau).  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 11. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Haydon, Hy, Alfred-ter, Lower Sydenham, Butcher. Pet Dec 17. Jan  
 10 at 12. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.  
 Higgs, Thos, Cockspur-st, Charing-cross. Pet Dec 17. Jan 10 at 1.  
 Briant, Winchester-house, Old Broad-st.  
 Hore, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau). Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 12. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Hubbard, Geo, Mornington-rd, Leytonstone, Journeyman Carpenter.  
 Pet Dec 16. Murray. Jan 3 at 12. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.  
 Hubbard, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 14 (for pau).  
 Brougham. Jan 5 at 11. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Hyams, Benj, Martha-st, Haggerstone, Beershop Keeper. Pet Dec 18.  
 Pepps. Jan 7 at 2. Alcock, Queen-st, Brompton.  
 Isaacs, Lewis, Leyton-rd, Stratford, Assistants. Pet Dec 16. Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 12. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Guildhall.  
 Jennings, Thos, Peterborough, Northamptonshire, Boot Salesman. Pet  
 Dec 17. Murray. Jan 3 at 11. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury, for  
 Smith, Peterborough.  
 Kick, Geo, Plumstead, Kent, out of business. Pet Dec 18. Murray.  
 Jan 5 at 11. Sword, Finsbury-pavement.  
 Lee, Thos, Lordship-pl, Chelsea, Plumber. Pet Dec 17. Jan 10 at 2.  
 Smith, Crooked-lane.  
 Lock, Francis John, Reading, Berks, Printer. Pet Dec 15. Jan 5 at  
 12. Wilkinson, Bedford-rd, Covent-garden.  
 Martinez, Manuel Garcia, Forten-rd, Hammersmith, out of business.  
 Pet Dec 17. Jan 10 at 1. Tiley, Finsbury-pl, South.  
 Masen, Hy, Tabernacle-sq, Beersall. Pet Dec 16. Pepps. Dec 31 at  
 2. Dobson, Mile End-rd.  
 Montagnol, Philip, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau).  
 Pepps. Jan 6 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Morley, Thos Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau).  
 Pepps. Dec 31 at 2. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Moulson, Jas Albert, High-st, Islington, Barman. Pet Dec 18. Jan  
 10 at 1. Ody, Trinity-st, Southwark.  
 Musgrave, Frank, Adelphi-ter, Strand, Professor of Music. Pet Dec  
 16. Pepps. Jan 7 at 1. Kent & Co, Cannon-st.  
 Page, John Offord, Old Kent-rd, Pork Butcher. Pet Dec 17. Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 1. Harcourt & Macarthur, Moorgate-st.  
 Pates, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau). Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 12. Lawrence, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Pease, Peter, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau). Mur-  
 ray. Jan 3 at 11. Hicks, Francis-ter, Hackney-wick.  
 Peewee, Wm Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau).  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 11. Charlton, Waterloo-rd.  
 Preston, Ernest, Sussex-st, Piccolo, Comm Agent. Pet Dec 17. Jan  
 10 at 12. Keighley & Gething, Ironmonger-lane.  
 Rowe, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 17 (for pau). Pepps.  
 Jan 7 at 2. Gosley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.  
 Sanderson, Frede, Geneva-rd, Brixton, no occupation. Pet Dec 16.  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 11. Heggerty, St George-st, Westminster.  
 Schafer, John Jacob, Cuningham-ter, Shepherd's-bush, Tobaccoist.  
 Pet Dec 18. Murray. Jan 3 at 2. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Guildhall.  
 Sheen, Richd, Castle Hedingham, Essex, Grocer. Pet Dec 17. Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 12. Reed & Co, Gresham-st.  
 Smee, Augustus John, New Cross-rd, Deptford, out of business. Pet  
 Dec 18. Pepps. Jan 7 at 2. Rigby, Gresham-st.  
 Smith, Jas, High Holborn, Baker. Pet Dec 16. Jan 5 at 1. Hicks,  
 Francis-ter, Hackney-wick.  
 Smith, Wm Abbotts, Finsbury-sq, Medical Practitioner. Pet Dec 16.  
 Murray. Jan 3 at 12. Durant, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.  
 Spragg, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau).  
 Brougham. Jan 10 at 11. Gosley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.  
 Spurgeon, Clement Moore, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 18  
 (for pau). Murray. Jan 3 at 12. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Startup, John, High-st, Woolwich, Baker. Pet Dec 17. Murray. Jan  
 3 at 1. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.  
 Stedman, Geo, Brighton, Sussex, out of business. Pet Dec 13. Pepps.  
 Jan 6 at 1. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Stevens, Wm, High-st, Borough, Southwark, Licensed Victualler. Pet  
 Dec 18. Murray. Jan 5 at 11. Barton & Drew, Fore-st.  
 Styles, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 15 (for pau).  
 Brougham. Jan 5 at 1.30. Harrison, Basinghall-st.  
 Thorne, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 8. Murray. Jan 5  
 at 11. Fitch, Craven-st, Charing-cross.  
 Thorogood, Jas, Wilson-st, Finsbury, Upholsterer. Pet Dec 16. Jan  
 5 at 1.30. Brighton, Bishopsgate-st, Without.  
 Trestrail, Fredk Gulliver, St Albans, Herts, Straw Hat Manufacturer.  
 Pet Dec 16. Jan 5 at 1.30.  
 Walker, Wm Edwd, Oakley-common, Bucks, Horse Dealer. Pet Dec 16.  
 Jan 10 at 11. Hembury, Barnet.  
 Weitzel, John Hy, Manor-ter, Oxford-rd, Kilburn, Baker. Pet Dec 18.  
 Murray. Jan 5 at 11. Burt, Guildhall-chambers.  
 Wilcox, John, Robert-st, Chelsea, Carpenter. Pet Dec 16. Murray.  
 Jan 3 at 11. Kynaston & Gasquet, King's Arm's-yard.  
 Williams, Jas, Cumberland-st, Chelsea, Hat Manufacturer. Pet Dec 16.  
 Jan 10 at 12. Groust, Suffolk-lane, Cannon-st.  
 Willmott, Geo, Hangerford-rd, Camden-town, Builder. Pet Dec 17.  
 Dec 18. Murray. Jan 10 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.  
 Wootton, John Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Dec 16 (for pau).  
 Brougham. Jan 10 at 11. Gosley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.

## To Surrender in the Country.

Alexander, Elias, Prisoner for Debt, Durham. Adj Dec 13. Ellis. San-  
 derland, Jan 4 at 12. Dixon, Sunderland.  
 Andrews, Cresswell, Henfield, Sussex, Miller. Pet Dec 17. Evershed.  
 Brighton, Jan 4 at 11. Lamb, Brighton.  
 Aspinall, Saml, Lpool, Grocer. Pet Dec 18. Lpool. Dec 31 at 12. Dixon,  
 Lpool.  
 Atkins, Chas, Birm, Boot Maker. Pet Dec 18. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at  
 10. Duke, Birm.  
 Baker, Wm, North Molton, Devon, Miller. Pet Dec 18. Exeter. Dec  
 31 at 10.30. Riccard & Son, South Molton; Floud, Exeter.  
 Barker, Thos, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Greengrocer. Pet Dec 18.  
 Trotter. Bishop Auckland, Jan 6 at 10. Hutchinsen, Bishop Auck-  
 land.  
 Barnett, Edwin, Lpool, Comm Agent. Pet Dec 17. Lpool. Dec 31 at  
 11. Belringer, Lpool.  
 Barrow, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Adj Dec 18. Lpool. Dec 31  
 at 12.  
 Baumber, Jacob, Lincoln, Baker. Pet Dec 16. Waite. Louth, Dec 31  
 at 10. Walker, Alford.  
 Baxter, Thos Alex, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 9 (for pau).  
 Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.  
 Beard, Edwin, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Fishmonger. Pet Dec 18. Langley.  
 Cardiff, Jan 4 at 11. Morgan, Cardiff.  
 Benjafield, Wm China, Gorleston, Suffolk, Seavenger. Pet Dec 17. Gt  
 Yarmouth, Jan 4 at 12. Cufaud, Gt Yarmouth.  
 Blake, Wm, jun, Mansfield, Notts, Painter. Pet Dec 16. Patchitt.  
 Mansfield, Jan 10 at 11.30. Gee, Chesterfield.  
 Bland, Jas Williamson, Harwich, Essex, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Dec 14.  
 Chapman. Harwich, Jan 1 at 3. Hill, Ipswich.  
 Bokenham, Thos Saml, Wenhaston, Suffolk, Miller. Pet Dec 18. Bass.  
 Halesworth, Jan 4 at 12. Read, Halesworth.  
 Bovey, Jas Maddicot, Torquay, Devon, Painter. Pet Dec 17. Exeter.  
 Dec 31 at 10. Hirtzel, Exeter.  
 Bowman, Robt, & John Hargraves Williams, Lpool, out of business.  
 Pet Dec 16. Hime. Lpool. Dec 31 at 11. Nordon, Lpool.  
 Brooks, Hy Lewis, Brighton, Bathur. Pet Dec 18. Evershed. Brighton,  
 Jan 6 at 11. Mills, Brighton.  
 Brooks, Wm, Brettell-lane, Staffordshire, Chartermaster. Pet Dec 16.  
 Harward. Stourbridge, Jan 3 at 10. Shakespeare, Oldbury.  
 Brown, Edwd Johnson, Manch, out of business. Pet Dec 18. Lpool.  
 Dec 31 at 11. Haigh & Co, for Sale, Manch.  
 Browning, Thos, Dover, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Pet Dec 16. Green-  
 how. Dover, Jan 1 at 12. Fox, Dover.  
 Carter, Chas Hy, Pudsey, Yorkshire, out of business. Pet Dec 14.  
 Bradford, Jan 11 at 9.15. Terry & Robinson, Bradford.  
 Cartwright, Wm, Stourbridge, Worcestershire, Journeyman Printer.  
 Pet Dec 17. Harward. Stourbridge, Jan 3 at 10. Prescott, Stour-  
 bridge.



- Clarkson, Jas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Boot Dealer. Pet Dec 18. Clayton. Newcastle, Jan 8 at 10. Britton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Clegg, Abraham, Heywood, Lancashire, Beerseller. Pet Dec 16. Grandy. Bury, Jan 6 at 11. Holland, Rochdale.
- Clements, Josiah, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Adj Dec 18. Lpool, Dec 31 at 12.
- Cooper, Joseph, Barton's Bank, Warwick, Labourer. Pet Dec 16. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Hawkes, Birm.
- Cooper, Wm Fred, Trammere, Cheshire, Accountant. Pet Dec 17. Wason. Birkenhead, Dec 31 at 10. Downham, Birkenhead.
- Cooper, Jacob Boulter, Market Lavington, Greengrocer. Pet Dec 13. Norris. Derizes, Jan 3 at 11. Rawlings, Melkham.
- Corless, Richd, Lpool, Hemp Dealer. Pet Dec 11. Lpool, Dec 31 at 11. Jenkins & Rae, Lpool.
- Cowley, Geo, Coventry, Watch Manufacturer. Pet Dec 17. Tudor. Birm, Dec 31 at 12. Homer, Coventry; Hodgson & Son, Birm.
- Cradock, Thos, Rawnsley, Staffordshire, Grocer. Pet Dec 17. Walsall, Jan 21 at 12. Glover, Walsall.
- Crowley, Joseph, Keighley, Yorkshire, out of business. Pet Dec 16. Keighley, Jan 5 at 3. Robinson, Keighley.
- Day, Mark, Manch, Agent. Pet Dec 15. Kay. Manch, Jan 12 at 9.30. Law, Manch.
- Dean, John Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 7 (for pau). Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.
- Dixon, Elijah, Preston, Lancashire, out of business. Pet Dec 16. Myres. Preston, Dec 31 at 12. Edleston, Preston.
- Dixon, Wm, Rochdale, Lancashire, Woollen Weaver. Pet Dec 15. Jackson. Rochdale, Dec 31 at 10. Holland, Rochdale.
- Donnelly, John, Dewsbury, York, Grocer. Pet Dec 17. Nelson. Dewsbury, Jan 6 at 12. Scholes & Breary, Dewsbury.
- Drake, John, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Adj Dec 18. Lpool, Dec 31 at 12.
- Embleton, Thos, Sunderland, Durham, Butcher. Pet Dec 15. Ellis. Sunderland, Jan 4 at 12.30. Dixon, Sunderland.
- Evans, David, Machynlleth, Montgomery, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Dec 17. Lpool, Dec 31 at 11. Evans & Lockett, Lpool.
- Fenn, Hiram, Birm, Engineer. Pet Dec 16. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Hawkes, Birm.
- Finch, Sarah, Hanley Castle, Worcester, Refreshment-house Keeper. Pet Dec 18. Crisp. Worcester, Jan 4 at 11. Knott, Worcester.
- Fiton, Thos, Bence Farm, Littleborough, Lancashire, Waste Dealer. Pet Dec 17. Jackson. Rochdale, Dec 31 at 11. Whitehead, Rochdale.
- Flowers, Wm, Worcester, Accountant. Pet Dec 18. Crisp. Worcester, Jan 4 at 11. Tree, Worcester.
- Forster, John, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Grocer. Pet Dec 17. Clayton. Newcastle, Jan 8 at 10. Britton, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
- Green, Richd, Norwich, Plasterer. Pet Dec 17. Palmer. Norwich, Dec 31 at 11. Chittock, Norwich.
- Hampson, Chas, & Geo Hampson, Nornanton, Yorkshire, Boot Dealer. Pet Dec 20. Leeds, Dec 31 at 11. Rooke, Leeds.
- Hardesty, John, Dewsbury, Yorkshire, Provision Dealer. Pet Dec 16. Nelson. Dewsbury, Jan 6 at 12. Scholes & Breary, Dewsbury.
- Harper, Jas Fletcher, jun, Dudley, Worcester, Soda Water Manufacturer. Pet Dec 16. Walker. Dudley, Jan 6 at 12. Warrington, Dudley.
- Hayes, Ebenezer, Monks Kirby, Warwick, Beerseller. Pet Dec 13. Gates. Lutterworth, Dec 30 at 12. Homer, Coventry.
- Hill, Thos, Gt Gidding, Huntingdon, Baker. Pet Dec 17. Sherard. Oundle, Jan 3 at 3. Richardson & Son, Oundle.
- Holbrook, Edwd John, Birm, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. East, Birm.
- Hutchings, Jas, Plymouth, Devon, Accountant. Pet Dec 18. Pearce. East St. Helens, Jan 5 at 11. Cartels.
- Johns, Stephen, Sithney, Cornwall, Farmer. Pet Dec 15. Hill. Helston, Jan 1 at 10. Holloway, Redruth.
- King, Geo, Hawkhurst, Kent, Fishmonger. Pet Dec 14. Weller. Tenterden, Jan 6 at 11. Philpott, Cranbrook.
- Kirk, Arthur, Leeds, Yorkshire, Provision Dealer. Pet Dec 11. Leeds, Dec 31 at 11. Clarke, Leeds.
- Kirkley, Wm, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, out of business. Pet Dec 15. Ellis. Sunderland, Jan 4 at 11. Bentham, Sunderland.
- Knight, Wm, Birm, Stationer. Pet Dec 16. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Eadie, Birm.
- Knowles, Joseph, Dudley-hill, nr Bradford, Yorkshire, Bootmaker. Pet Dec 14. Bradford, Jan 7 at 9.15. Rhodes, Bradford.
- Lawton, Joseph, Walton-vale, nr Lpool, Cotton Dealer. Pet Dec 20. Lpool, Dec 31 at 12. Eddy, Lpool.
- Leach, Geo, Stockton, Painter. Pet Dec 16. Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees, Dec 31 at 11. Draper, Stockton.
- Lee, Wm, Maidstone, Kent, Carpenter. Pet Dec 14. Scudamore. Maidstone, Dec 30 at 11. Stephenson, Maidstone.
- Llewellyn, John, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 10 (for pau). Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.
- Lloyd, Robt, Dolgelly, Merioneth, Blacksmith. Pet Dec 16. Walker. Dolgelly, Jan 4 at 11. Williams, Dolgelly.
- Lloyd, Wm, Little Bolton, Lancashire, Contractor. Pet Dec 16. Holden. Bolton, Jan 5 at 10. Richardson & Dowling, Bolton.
- Lower, John, Hadley, Salop, Sergeant-Major. Pet Dec 17. Newill. Wellington, Jan 14 at 11. Marcy, Wellington.
- Magg, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 7 (for pau). Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.
- Mark, Isaac, Keswick, Cumberland, Gentleman's Servant. Pet Dec 18. Broatch. Keswick, Dec 31 at 11. Fisher, Ambleside.
- Martin, Alfred, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 7 (for pau). Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.
- Mason, Geo, Birm, Journeyman Jeweller. Pet Dec 18. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Sargent, Birm.
- Milla, Edwd Arthur Edmund, Birm, Upholsterer. Pet Dec 18. Guest. Birm, Jan 7 at 10. Harrison, Birm.
- Milom, Hy, Bishopston, Gloucestershire, Butcher's Assistant. Pet Dec 14. Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12. Pigeon.
- Moody, John, Frome, Somersetshire, Fishmonger. Pet Dec 17. Messier. Frome, Jan 4 at 11. McCarthy, Frome.
- Morris, Wm Hy, Blackpool, Lancashire, Joiner. Pet Dec 15. Pattison. Foulton-le-Fyde, Dec 31 at 10. Bond, Preston.
- Modell, Hy, Bradford, Berks, Tailor. Pet Dec 15. Collins. Reading, Jan 1 at 10. Smith, Reading.
- Mountain, Joseph Sedgwick, Moss Side, Lancashire, out of business. Pet Dec 14. Kay. Manch, Jan 14 at 9.30. Blair & Chorlton, Manch.
- Mountain, Hy Wallace, Moss Side, Lancashire, Warehouseman. Pet Dec 14. Kay. Manch, Jan 14 at 9.30. Blair & Chorlton, Manch.
- Naylor, Wm, Drighlington, Yorkshire, Greengrocer. Pet Dec 18. Bradford, Jan 11 at 9.15. Hill, Bradford.
- Oliver, David, Dowias, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Pet Dec 15. Russell. Merthyr Tydfil, Jan 1 at 11. Jones, Merthyr Tydfil.
- Orrer, Geo, Worcester, Bookbinder. Pet Dec 15. Crisp. Worcester, Jan 4 at 11. Tree, Worcester.
- Pelling, Wm Herbert, Bristol, Commercial Traveller. Pet Dec 17. Exeter, Dec 31 at 11. Murley & Son, Bristol; Rogers, Exeter.
- Penney, Joseph, Southsea, Hants, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Dec 18. Howard. Portsmouth, Jan 21 at 12. Champ, Portsea.
- Poole, Wm, Leeds, Traveller. Pet Dec 17. Marshall. Leeds, Dec 30 at 12. Granger & Son, Leeds.
- Pope, Alfred, Prisoner for Debt, Taunton. Adj Dec 11. Exeter. Dec 31 at 10.
- Potter, Thos, Nottingham, out of business. Pet Dec 17. Patchitt. Nottingham, Feb 9 at 10.30. Heath, Nottingham.
- Price, Jas, Tunstall, Staffordshire, out of business. Pet Dec 18. Chalinor. Hanley, Jan 8 at 11. Salt, Tunstall.
- Pryce, Edwd, Welshpool, Montgomeryshire, out of business. Pet Dec 17. Lpool, Dec 31 at 12. Evans & Lockett, Lpool, for Howell & Co, Welshpool.
- Pullman, Jas, Ottery St Mary, Devonshire, Stonemason. Pet Dec 18. Stamp. Honiton, Dec 31 at 11. Jeffery, Ottery St Mary.
- Raistrick, Thos, Bradford, York, Bootmaker. Pet Dec 16. Bradford, Jan 11 at 9.15. Hill, Bradford.
- Ramsden, Wm, Wakefield, Yorkshire, Shopkeeper. Pet Dec 15. Mason. Wakefield, Jan 4 at 11. Wainright, Wakefield.
- Ricketts, Wm Chas, Gloucester, Baker. Pet Dec 15. Wilms. Gloucester, Jan 1 at 12. Cooke, Gloucester.
- Rider, Job, Shrewsbury, Salop, Innkeeper. Pet Dec 15. Peele. Shrewsbury, Jan 10 at 10. Craig, Shrewsbury.
- Roberts, Edwd, Shrewsbury, Salop, no occupation. Pet Dec 17. Peele. Shrewsbury, Jan 10 at 10.30. Kough, Shrewsbury.
- Roberts, Jas, Lpool, Butcher. Pet Dec 18. Hime. Lpool, Dec 31 at 11.30. Parker, Lpool.
- Robinson, Danl, Floore, Northamptonshire, Rope Maker. Pet Dec 18. Willoughby. Daventry, Dec 29 at 10. Roche, Daventry.
- Robinson, Wm, Brighton, Sussex, out of business. Pet Dec 17. Eveshed. Brighton, Jan 4 at 11. Runnacles, Brighton.
- Sansom, Eliza, Minchinhampton, Gloucestershire, Foreman to a Carrier. Pet Dec 15. Wilton. Gloucester, Jan 1 at 12. Cooke, Gloucester.
- Silvey, Thos, Bristol, Labourer. Pet Dec 15. Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12. Atchley.
- Smith, Wm Willis, Prisoner for Debt, York. Adj Dec 18. Leeds, Dec 31 at 11.
- Smith, Wm, Bradford, Yorkshire, Grocer. Pet Dec 14. Bradford, Jan 7 at 9.15. Hutchinson, Bradford.
- Smith, John, Halifax, Yorkshire, Piece Sorter. Pet Dec 16. Rankin. Halifax, Dec 31 at 10. Leeming, Halifax.
- Smith, Walter, Broadstone, Salop, Tailor. Pet Dec 15. Williams. Ludlow, Dec 22 at 10. Weyman, Ludlow.
- Stanton, Joseph, Hapfayland, Worcestershire, Tailor. Pet Dec 18. Crisp. Worcester, Jan 4 at 11. Allen, Worcester.
- Thompson, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 10 (for pau). Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.
- Torrings, Wm Alex, Shoreham, Sussex, Comm Agent. Pet Dec 15. Evershed. Brighton, Jan 4 at 11. Lamb, Brighton.
- Travis, John, sen, Treton, Yorkshire, Stonemason. Pet Dec 17. Newman. Rotherham, Jan 13 at 1. Branson & Coulson, Sheffield.
- Wall, Edwin, Wm Wenlock, Salop, Market Gardener. Pet Dec 15. Madeley, Jan 12 at 12. Leake, Shifnal.
- Webster, Jonathan Lupton, Fudsey, Yorkshire, Auctioneer. Pet Dec 20. Leeds, Dec 31 at 11. Carr, Leeds.
- White, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Adj Dec 18. Lpool, Dec 31 at 12.
- Wildsmith, Allen, Bailly, Yorkshire, out of business. Pet Dec 16. Nelson. Dewsbury, Jan 6 at 12. Harle, Leeds.
- Willis, W, Manch, General Merchant. Pet Dec 14. Macrae. Manch, Dec 31 at 11. Sampson, Manch.
- Wilson, John, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet Dec 10 (for pau). Harley. Bristol, Jan 14 at 12.
- Wright, Chas, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Adj Dec 13. Kay. Manch, Jan 13 at 9.30.
- Wynne, John, Lpool, Draper. Pet Dec 20. Lpool, Dec 1 at 12. Lupto, Lpool.

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Dec 17, 1869.

Rhodes, Thos, & Joseph Dobson Good, Leeds, Woollen Cloth Merchants. Dec 13.

Nicholson, Robt, Southport, Lancashire, Painter. Nov 27.

Saville, Richd, Manch, Joiner. Dec 15.

## GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON, E.C.

SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Proposals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life Interests, or other adequate securities.

Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following form:—

## PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....

Introduced by (state name and address of solicitor)

Amount required & Time and mode of repayment (i.e., whether for a term certain, or by annual or other payments)

Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or buildings, state the net annual income).

State what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the Gresham Office in connection with the security.

By order of the Board,  
F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.

